NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS Congressional Information Service, Inc
Washington, D.C

Calendar No. 944

98th Congress *2d Session*	SENATE	Report 98-500

OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1985

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2723]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR PROCUREMENT, FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AND FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES AND FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR CIVIL DEFENSE, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

May 31, 1984.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
34-685 O WASHINGTON : 1984

5203-2

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN TOWER, Texas, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
ROGER W. JEPSEN, Iowa
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
PETE WILSON, California

SAM NUNN, Georgia
JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
GARY HART, Colorado
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois

JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*
ALAN R. YUSPEH, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE C. DAUTH, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Page

Purpose of the bill 1
Budget waiver resolution 2
Budget impact of Committee bill 2
Summary of funds and manpower authorized in Committee bill 3
Summary of funds recommended for authorization 4
Summary of recommended manpower authorization 7
Highlights of Committee action 7
Summary of notification, reports or studies requested 13
Title I, Part A—Procurement 17
Summary of adjustment to fiscal year 1984 procurement authorization request by service 17
  Army aircraft 18
  Army missiles 24
  Army weapons and tracked combat vehicles 28
  Army ammunition 35
  Army other procurement 43
  Navy aircraft 48
  Navy weapons 62
  Navy shipbuilding and conversion 69
  Navy other procurement 82
  Marine Corps procurement 85
  Air Force aircraft 91
  Air Force missiles 106
  Air Force other procurement 113
  Defense Agencies procurement 119
  Multi-year contracts 120
  Guard and Reserve equipment 122
Title I, Part B—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation 123
Summary of adjustment to fiscal year 1984 RDT&E authorization request by service 124
  Army 125
  Navy 134
  Air Force 159
  Defense Agencies 171
Title I, Part C—Operation and Maintenance 176
  Army 177
  Navy 180
  Marine Corps 183
  Air Force 184
  Defense Agencies 186
  Army Reserve 188
  Navy Reserve 188
  Marine Corps Reserve 189
  Air Force Reserve 189
  Army National Guard 190
  Air National Guard 191
Other budget activities 191
Other provisions 192
Stock funds 192
Title I, Part D—Personnel 194
  Subpart 1—Active Forces 194
  Subpart 2—Reserve Forces 198
  Subpart 3—Civilian Personnel 200

Page
Title I, Part D—Personnel—Continued
  Subpart 4—Military Training Student Loads 203
Title I, Part E—Compensation, Benefits, and Health Care Matters 204
  Subpart 1—Pay, Allowance, and Benefits 204
  Subpart 2—Health Care Matters 222
Title I, Part F—Personnel Management 226
Title I, Part G—Civil Defense 240
Title I, Part H—Defense Procurement Improvements 240
Title I, Part I—General Provisions 259
Title I, Part J—Codification of Certain Recurring and Other Provisions of Law 265
Title II—Military Construction 268
Title III—Department of Energy Matters 359
Departmental recommendations 379
Committee action 432
Fiscal data 432
Congressional action on procurement, R.D.T.&E., operation and maintenance, and civil defense authorization requests 438
Relationship of annual authorization to Department of Defense appropriations 439
Regulatory impact 441
Changes in existing law 441
Additional views of Mr. Cohen 513
Additional views of Mr. Hart 518
Additional views of Mr. Levin 521
Additional views of Mr. Kennedy 523
Additional views of Mr. Bingaman 525

Calendar No. 944

98th Congress
2d Session

SENATE

Report
98-500

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR PROCUREMENT, FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AND FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES AND FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR CIVIL DEFENSE, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

May 31, 1984.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. Tower, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2723]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation, and operation and maintenance for the Armed Forces, and working capital funds, for civil defense, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the military training student loads, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and mainte-

nance and the working capital funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985;

(2) authorize the personnel end strength for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1985;

(3) authorize the personnel average strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1985;

(4) authorize civilian end strengths for each military department of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985;

(5) authorize the annual average military training student load for each of the active and reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1985;

(6) impose certain reporting requirements;

(7) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and R.D.T. & E. actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, make certain changes to existing law, and for other purposes;

(8) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985;

(9) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1985; and

(10) authorize appropriations for civil defense, including programs of the Federal Energy Management Agency, for fiscal year 1985.

BUDGET WAIVER RESOLUTION

The committee reported a budget waiver resolution, in order to comply with the requirement of the Congressional Budget Act (sec. 402(a)) that all bills authorizing new budget authority be reported by May 15 preceding the fiscal year involved.

BUDGET IMPACT OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

The request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 1985 totals $313.4 billion in budget authority. Of this total request, $242.8 billion is requested for programs authorized in the committee bill. These programs include procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, working capital funds, civil defense, military construction, and weapon programs of the Department of Energy.

In May, the Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget forwarded to the committee proposed funding reductions to the February request totaling $14.4 billion, an amount consistent with the broader budget agreement now contained in S. Con. Res. 106, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1985. However, for purposes of clarity and consistency with other pending legislation, the committee bill was drafted against the February request.

The bill reported by the committee includes a recommended amount of $230.2 billion for the above-named accounts, a reduction of $12.6 billion from the President's February request. While funding for military pay and benefits is not included in the defense authorization bill, proposed changes in manpower end-strengths and pay recommended in the bill, as well as other changes in law, will result in an additional reduction of $1.8 billion in appropriations.

The net impact of the bill, therefore, is a reduction of $14.4 billion in budget authority from the President's request for national defense.

	Billion
Funds authorized for procurement, RDT&E, operation and maintenance, working capital funds, civil defense, military construction, and DOE weapons programs	$12.6
Funding impact of manpower authorization and legislative restrictions	−1.8
Total	−14.4

An overall summary of the funding and manpower provisions of the bill are as follows:

SUMMARY OF FUNDS AND MANPOWER AUTHORIZED IN COMMITTEE BILL

[Dollar amounts in millions; totals may not add due to rounding]

	Fiscal year—		Change from request	Committee recommendation
	1984 budget authority	1985 request		
Procurement	$85,996	$107,561	−$6,865	$100,696
Research, development, test and evaluation	26,868	33,994	−1,439	32,555
Operation and maintenance	70,941	80,927	−2,463	78,464
Working capital funds	(1)	1,762	−125	1,637
Civil defense	169	253	−62	191
Military construction	7,195	10,500	−1,202	9,298
DOE weapons programs	6,619	7,786	−462	7,324
Total	197,788	242,782	−12,618	230,164
Manpower (in thousands):				
Active duty	2,135.9	2,165.8	10.3	2,155.5
Selected Reserve	1,035.6	1,088.6	8.5	1,080.1
Civilian	1,056.2	1,084.8	6.6	1,078.2
Total	4,227.7	4,339.2	25.4	4,313.8

[1] Authorization for Working Capital Funds was not required prior to fiscal year 1985.

SUMMARY OF FUNDS RECOMMENDED FOR AUTHORIZATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1984 budget authority	Authorization		Committee change from February request	Committee recommendation
		Fiscal year 1985 February request	Fiscal year 1985 May budget revision		
TITLE I					
PROCUREMENT					
Army:					
Aircraft	3,273,248	4,008,300	3,780,900	−199,800	3,808,500
Missiles	2,824,100	3,442,400	3,147,900	−113,600	3,328,800
Weapons and tracked combat vehicles	4,663,033	5,092,700	4,566,000	−354,700	4,738,000
Ammunition	1,939,900	2,494,000	2,264,900	+20,800	2,514,800
Other procurement	4,649,928	6,022,400	5,603,400	−545,800	5,476,600
Army National Guard equipment	100,000	0	0	+50,000	50,000
Total, Army procurement	17,450,209	21,059,80	19,363,100	−1,143,100	19,916,700
Navy:					
Aircraft	10,164,608	11,474,200	10,934,000	−529,500	10,944,700
Weapons	3,768,579	4,650,860	4,408,660	−184,900	4,465,960
Shipbuilding and conversion	11,437,000	13,141,900	11,467,700	−943,700	12,198,200
Other procurement	4,314,543	5,953,900	5,502,900	−605,700	5,348,200
Navy Reserve equipment	51,000	0	0	+20,000	20,000
Marine Corps	1,741,306	1,978,581	1,857,881	−132,500	1,846,081
Total, Navy procurement	31,478,036	37,199,441	34,171,141	−2,376,300	34,823,141
Air Force:					
Aircraft	21,387,710	28,676,500	26,390,800	−1,726,400	26,950,100
Missiles	7,811,838	9,820,600	9,385,600	−1,000,700	8,819,900
Other procurement	6,895,937	9,561,500	8,499,300	−602,200	8,959,300
Air National Guard equipment	25,000	0	0	+20,000	20,000
Total, Air Force procurement	36,120,485	48,058,600	44,285,700	−3,349,300	44,749,300
Defense agencies procurement	947,157	1,243,500	1,223,000	−36,500	1,207,000
Total, procurement	85,995,887	107,561,341	99,042,941	−6,865,200	100,696,141
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION [1]					
Army	4,259,375	4,987,860	4,867,660	−336,550	4,621,310
Navy (including Marine Corps)	7,571,718	9,833,576	9,447,576	−438,968	9,394,608
Air Force	12,220,706	14,401,955	14,192,155	−429,448	13,972,507
Defense agencies	2,767,420	4,708,296	4,653,200	−200,755	4,507,541
Director, test and evaluation	49,000	62,000	60,379	−3,000	59,000
Total, research, development, test, and evaluation	26,868,219	33,993,687	33,220,970	−1,438,721	32,554,966
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Army	17,327,496	19,486,518	18,627,518	−847,400	18,639,118
Navy	22,258,728	26,248,426	25,494,826	−614,900	25,633,526
Marine Corps	1,547,420	1,683,069	1,648,169	−34,900	1,648,169
Air Force	17,714,095	20,234,500	19,618,200	−697,700	19,536,800
Defense agencies	6,562,682	7,338,370	7,218,527	−160,900	7,177,470
Army Reserve	691,890	715,450	713,150	−2,300	713,150
Navy Reserve	636,490	829,531	818,431	−11,100	818,431
Marine Corps Reserve	52,349	58,642	58,642	0	58,642
Air Force Reserve	790,700	883,461	872,661	−10,800	872,661
Army National Guard	1,187,440	1,404,643	1,388,443	−11,100	1,393,543
Air National Guard	1,806,600	1,862,148	1,810,248	−51,900	1,810,248

SUMMARY OF FUNDS RECOMMENDED FOR AUTHORIZATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1984 budget authority	Authorization		Committee change from February request	Committee recommendation
		Fiscal year 1985 February request	Fiscal year 1985 May budget revision		
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice	990	914	914	0	914
Claims, Defense	160,400	177,900	157,900	−20,000	157,900
Court of Military Appeals	3,372	3,470	3,416	−54	3,416
Summer Olympics	50,000	[2] 0	[2] 0	0	[2] 0
Environmental restoration fund	150,000	[2] 0	[2] 0	0	[2] 0
Total, operation and maintenance	70,940,571	80,927,042	78,431,045	−2,463,054	78,463,988
WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS [3]					
Army stock fund		366,448	366,448	0	366,448
Navy stock fund		563,907	473,007	−90,900	473,007
Marine Corps stock fund		34,908	34,908	0	34,908
Air Force stock fund		666,093	631,793	−34,300	631,793
Defense stock fund		130,070	130,700	0	130,700
Total, working capital funds		1,762,056	1,636,856	−125,200	1,636,856
Federal Emergency Preparedness Agency civil defense program	169,204	252,478	190,478	−62,000	190,478
Total, title I	183,973,881	224,496,604	212,522,290	−10,954,175	213,542,429
TITLE II					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Army	1,184,1409	2,261,720	1,981,720	−235,600	2,026,120
Navy/Marine Corps	1,236,517	1,781,200	1,624,800	−116,675	1,664,525
Air Force	1,465,993	2,078,110	1,783,710	−330,152	1,747,958
Defense agencies	281,802	459,500	442,300	−121,055	338,445
Army National Guard	67,620	88,900	88,900	+8,100	97,000
Air National Guard	108,888	102,900	102,900	+7,800	110,700
Army Reserve	54,700	70,400	70,400	0	70,400
Naval Reserve	30,605	60,800	60,800	+1,200	62,000
Air Force Reserve	41,200	56,800	67,800	0	67,800
NATO infrastructure	50,000	296,700	131,700	−165,000	131,700
Total, military construction	4,521,465	7,268,030	6,355,030	−951,382	6,316,648
FAMILY HOUSING					
Army	1,238,243	1,425,454	1,403,554	−89,842	1,335,612
Navy	612,263	727,886	703,486	−40,830	687,056
Air Force	805,415	1,058,632	1,020,932	−120,059	938,573
Defense agencies	17,841	19,800	19,300	0	19,800
Total, family housing	2,673,762	3,231,772	3,147,272	−250,731	2,981,041
Total, title II	7,195,227	10,499,802	9,502,302	−1,202,113	9,297,689
TITLE III					
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS					
Weapons activities	3,755,925	4,526,004	4,319,204	−321,700	4,204,304
Verification and control technology	67,850	76,700	76,700	0	76,700
Materials production	1,571,934	1,846,200	1,724,100	−128,100	1,718,100
Defense waste and by-products management	671,530	743,071	718,071	−12,000	731,071

SUMMARY OF FUNDS RECOMMENDED FOR AUTHORIZATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1984 budget authority	Authorization		Committee change from February request	Committee recommendation
		Fiscal year 1985 February request	Fiscal year 1985 May budget revision		
Nuclear safeguards and security	52,000	62,700	62,700	0	62,700
Security investigations	29,500	34,000	34,000	0	34,000
Naval reactors development	470,000	496,900	496,900	0	496,900
Total, title III	[4] 6,618,739	7,785,575	7,431,675	−461,800	7,323,775
Grand total of bill	197,787,847	242,781,981	229,456,267	−12,618,088	230,163,893

---

[1] Includes authorization for special foreign currency program as follows:

	Fiscal year	
	1984	1985
Army	$1,474	$760
Navy (including Marine Corps)	1,376	7,500
Defense agencies	200	390
Total	3,050	8,650

[2] $313 million for environmental restoration fund is included in various service accounts, and changes from the request are reflected in the Sericve totals.

[3] Appropriations for working capital funds did not require authorization prior to fiscal year 1985.

[4] Authorization for fiscal year 1984 DOE programs was not enacted; amounts in this column reflect authorization assumed necessary to support final appropriation level.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED MANPOWER AUTHORIZATIONS

ACTIVE DUTY MANPOWER, FISCAL YEAR 1985

[End of strength in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1985 request	Recommendation	Change from request
Army	780.8	780.8	0
Navy	575.3	572.8	−2.5
Marine Corps	199.5	199.0	−.5
Air Force	610.2	602.9	−7.3
Total	2,165.8	2,155.5	−10.3

SELECTED RESERVE PERSONNEL, FISCAL YEAR 1985

[Average strength in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1985 request	Recommendation	Change from request
Army National Guard	440.1	435.25	−4.85
Army Reserve	288.4	285.6	−2.8
Naval Reserve	124.2	124.1	−.1
Marine Corps Reserve	44.3	44.3	0
Air National Guard	106.2	105.438	−.762
Air Force Reserve	72.9	72.9	0
Coast Guard Reserve	12.5	12.5	0
Total	1,088.6	1,080.08	−8.5

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, FISCAL YEAR 1985

[End strength in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1985 request	Recommendation	Change from request
Army	401.8		
Navy/Marine Corps	339.6		
Air Force	253.6		
Defense Agencies	89.8		
Total	1,084.8	1,078.2	−6.6

HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee recommends a total of $230.2 billion to be authorized for procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, stock funds, civil defense, military construction, and Department of Energy weapons programs for fiscal year 1985. Additions and reductions highlighted below are from the President's original budget request.

PROCUREMENT

Reduction of $550 million and 19 missiles for procurement of the MX missile system.

Reduction of $91.1 million for conversion of strategic support ship (TAK).

Reduction of $50 million for procurement of Trident training equipment.

Reduction of $29 million for procurement of B-52 modifications and associated spares.

Reduction of $193.2 million and 10 kits, and associated spares for CFM-56 reengining and other modifications for KC-135 tankers.

Reduction of $73 million and 23 missiles and associated spares for Pershing II.

Reduction of $95 million for procurement of production readiness items associated with binary weapons.

Approval of $163 million for initial procurement and long lead items for Trident II (D-5) missiles.

Approval of $1,489.5 million for procurement of one Trident SSBN.

Approval of $532.1 million for procurement of 180 Tomahawk Sea-Launched Cruise Missiles (SLCM).

Approval of $5,558.2 million for procurement of 34 B-1B strategic bomber aircraft and $1,544.4 for advanced procurement.

Approval of $557.2 million for procurement of 120 Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles (GLCM).

Approval of $1,199.2 million for the procurement of 144 Apache attack helicopters.

Approval of $309.2 million for the procurement of 78 UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters on a multi-year contract.

Approval of $272.0 million for the CH-47D Chinook helicopter modification program on a multi-year contract.

Reduction of $17.0 million requested for the Army's OV-1 Mohawk JSTARS program.

Approval of $199.6 million for the procurement of 6 A-6E Intruder aircraft.

Approval of $742.2 million for the procurement of 32 AV-8B Harrier aircraft.

Approval of $2,348.1 million for the procurement of 84 F/A-18 Hornet aircraft.

Approval of $782.9 million for the procurement of 24 F-14 Tomcat aircraft.

Reduction of $32.0 million requested for the procurement of 12 UC-12B aircraft.

Addition of $50.0 million for the procurement of Navy Adversary aircraft.

Reduction of 6 F-15's from the administration's request for 48 aircraft.

Approval of $2,509.4 million for the procurement of 150 F-16 aircraft.

Reduction of $16.4 million requested for the procurement of 2 Range Control aircraft.

Reduction of $304.9 million requested for the procurement of AMRAAM missiles.

Addition of $130.0 million for the procurement of 600 AIM-7M Sparrow missiles.

Reduction of $72.0 million for the procurement of LANTIRN targeting pods.

Approval of the purchase of 720 M-1 Abrams tanks.

Reduction of the requested buy of M-2/3 Bradley Fighting Vehicles from 710 to 655.

Reduction of the requested buy of Sergeant York Division Air Defense Systems to 117 from the request of 132.

Approval of 440 missiles and fire units for the Patriot Air Defense Missile System which holds production at the fiscal year 1984 level.

Addition of $32 million for Chaparral Air Defense Missile System to begin converting Army National Guard battalions.

Approval of $2,262.2 million for construction of four SSN-688 class attack submarines.

Approval of the reactivation of a third battleship using prior year funds, including approval of reprograming of fiscal year 1984 funds.

Approval of $3,125.6 million for construction of three CG-47 class guided missile cruisers and $24.4 million in advance procurement.

Approval of $1,173.4 million for construction of the lead ship of the DDG-51 class of guided missile destroyers.

Approval of $349.5 million for construction of 4 MCM-1 class mine countermeasures ships.

Approval of $128.4 million for construction of 2 TAGOS-1 class ocean surveillance ships, a reduction of $64.5 million and 1 ship from the request.

Approval of $400.6 million for procurement of 24 SH-60B LAMPS Mark III ASW helicopters, an addition of $67.4 million and 6 aircraft to the request.

Approval of $321.6 million for procurement of 9 P-3C Orion maritime patrol aircraft and $50.0 million in advance procurement.

Approval of $65.9 million for 6 SH-2F LAMPS Mark I ASW helicopters, at least three of which are for the Naval Reserve.

Approval of $89.0 million for procurement of 108 MK-48 Mod 4 torpedoes, a reduction of 36 torpedoes and $38.7 million, and approval of $123.9 million for procurement of 44 MK-48 ADCAP (advanced capability) modification kits.

Approval of $128.5 million for procurement of 300 MK-60 Captor mines.

Approval of $562.6 million for construction of three TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

Approval of $245 million for construction of 2 TAGS class ocean survey ships.

Reduction of $175 million for ship repricing.

Approval of $406.0 million for construction of two LSD-41 class dock landing ships and $83.5 million in advance procurement.

Approval of $39.2 million in advance procurement for construction of the second LHD-1 class amphibious assault ship.

Approval of $15.0 million in advance procurement for a Service Life Extension program for LPD-4 class amphibious transport docks.

Approval of $31.0 million for acquisition of commercial ships for the Ready Reserve Force.

Approval of $198.8 million for procurement of nine Landing Craft, Air Cushion and $31.3 million in advance procurement.

Approval of $44.0 million for conversion of two TACS class auxiliary crane ships.

Approval of $37.6 million for conversion of one TAVB class aviation logistics support ship and $5.2 million in advance procurement.

Approval of $33.9 million for procurement of used C-9B transport aircraft and $6.1 million in initial spares.

Approval of $190.7 million for procurement of eight KC-10A Advanced Tanker/Cargo Aircraft, $375.3 million in advance procurement, and $56.0 million in initial spares.

Reduction in the procurement of the C-5B Strategic Airlift Aircraft from ten to eight aircraft costing $1,477.6 million, $304.1 million in advance procurement, and $72.3 million in initial spares.

Approval of $55.1 million for C-20A Special Air Mission Aircraft and $5.7 million in initial spares.

Approval of $242.2 million for modifications to C-130 tactical Airlift Aircraft.

Approval of $128.9 million for the CRAF Enhancement program.

Addition of $186.3 million for eight C-130H Tactical Airlift Aircraft for the Air National Guard and two C-130H's for the active force and $7.8 million in initial spares.

Addition of $16.0 million for modification of four C-131 Mission Support Aircraft of the Air National Guard.

Approval of $96.9 million for a Service Life Extension program for 240 LVT-7 Assault Amphibian Vehicles.

Approval of $242.8 million for procurement of 292 Light Armored Vehicles.

Addition of $20.8 million for procurement of Army Ammunition for production base improvements, training requirements and to increase procurement of the AT-4 anti-armor weapon and the 155mm HE Copperhead projectile.

Approval of $281.9 million for procurement of the combined effects munition.

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Implements a new provision dealing with weapon systems warranties.

Requires regulations for allocating overhead to parts to which the prime contractor has added little value.

Lowers the threshold for submission of cost and pricing data from $500,000 to $100,000.

Requires an economic order quantity where practicable.

Establishes an advocate for competition.

Requires that personnel evaluations take account of improvements in competition and cost savings.

Prohibits contractor from limiting subcontractor sales directly to the Federal Government.

Requires the publication of regulations dealing with procurement in the Federal Register.

Establishes new procedures for planning for future competition in procurement.

Encourages new competitors to broaden the industrial base.

Establishes programs for technical data management.

Requires that technical data to be furnished in contracts be specified.

Establishes procedures for validating proprietary data restrictions.

Requires DOD to develop a program to update its computer capability to manage spare parts.

Enlarges a program of procurement technical assistance.

Makes technical amendments to the Selected Acquisition Report and Unit Cost Systems Report.

Requires that key procurement managers serve for a tour of duty for at least 4 years.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Approval of $1,716.3 million to continue development of the MX missile.

Reduction of $77.3 million from the request for ICBM modernization associated with deep underground basing and accuracy MARV development.

Addition of $10 million for the Air Force's Advanced Strategic Missile System program to develop ICBM penetration aids.

Approval of $2,086.1 million to continue Trident II development.

Reduction of $6.37 million for the request for Tomahawk Sea Launched Cruise Missile development.

Approval of $508.3 million to continue B-1B development.

Reduction of $8.0 million from the Air Force request for Common Strategic Rotary Launcher (CSRL) development.

Reduction of $26 million from the Air Force request to begin development of an advanced air-to-surface missile.

Reduction of $150 million from the request for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Addition of $10 million for development of Navy Strategic Communications; approval of $77.1 million for the development of the E-6A TACAMO aircraft.

Approval of $143.28 million for development of the Air Force Miniature Homing Vehicle Anti-Satellite System.

Reduction of $5.0 million from the administration's request for the LHX.

Reduction of $45.0 million from the request of $113.4 million for the VTX.

Approval of $158.5 million for development of the JVX.

Addition of $50.0 million for A-6E Improvements.

Addition of $15.0 million to begin development of an austere, all-weather capability for the F/A-18.

Addition of $12.0 million to begin development of a Marine low cost FLIR.

Approval of $98.3 million for development of the LANTIRN system.

Approval of $98.2 million for development of Air Force JSTARS.

Approval of $146.9 million for the development of the F-15E.

Approval of $24.0 million for the development of the cranked-arrow wing F-16.

Reduction of $20.0 million for development of the submarine ASW Stand-Off Weapon.

Approval of $174.3 million for development of a new design nuclear-powered attack submarine (SSN-21).

Reduction of $43.0 million for seven programs involving airborne anti-submarine warfare.

Deletion of $5.751 million for the Navy's SURTASS program.

Reduction of $19.5 million for the Aircraft Carrier ASW Helicopter program.

Addition of $14.6 million in RDT&E,N and $11.7 million in the aircraft procurement account for adaptation of the Penguin anti-ship missile for LAMPS MK-III helicopters.

Reduction of $5.0 million for the Navy's Advanced Surface-to-Air Missile program.

Reduction of $10 million for continued development of the DDG-51 combat system.

Addition of $20 million for the Navy's Mark 92 Fire Control System Upgrade program.

Reduction of $24.662 million for the Navy's Regional Tactical Surveillance program.

Addition of $1.0 million for the Navy's Mine Development (Advanced) program.

Deletion of $2.959 million for Surface Ship Navigation Systems.

Approval of $324.048 million for the Navy's Defense Research Sciences program.

Deletion of $7.95 million for the Navy's Advanced Technology for Logistics Information program.

Reduction of $14.569 million for the Navy's RDT&E laboratory and facilities management program.

Deletion of $4.571 million for the Amphibious Assault Craft.

Addition of $6.0 million for Joint Service Rotary Engine Development.

Approval of $129.285 million for the C-17 Airlift Aircraft.

Addition of $2.0 million for a C-5A Airlift Aircraft demonstration.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Recommended $78.5 billion for Operation and Maintenance of the armed forces in fiscal year 1985. This amounts to real growth of over 6.5 percent above the fiscal year 1984 program.

Recommended reductions of $2.5 billion. Of this amount, 35 percent is associated with economic changes in the price of fuel and in foreign currency.

Approved most of the reductions proposed in the May budget revisions, but did *not* approve the proposed reductions in flying hours, the deferral of an SSBN overhaul, nor the proposed deactivation of the Army National Guard Roland air defense unit.

MANPOWER

Reduction of 10,260 active duty personnel from the total requested end strenth of 2,165,800.

Approval of a 4% increase in basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence for all personnel, except E-1's with less than 4 months of active duty whose pay would not be increased.

Modification of the basic allowance for quarters and the variable housing allowance to more closely align these allowances with the housing costs of military members.

Approval of a total authorized average strength for the Selected Reserve of 1,080,088, an increase of more than 44,000 above the authorized average strength for fiscal year 1984.

Extension of the authority to pay enlistment and reenlistment bonuses through fiscal year 1986.

Reduction of 6,600 civilian personnel from the total requested end strength of 1,084,800.

Continuation of the exemption of industrially-funded civilians from civilian personnel ceilings.

SUMMARY OF NOTIFICATIONS, REPORTS OR STUDIES REQUESTED

PROCUREMENT

1. A report from the Department of Defense to assess the desirability, from both a total munitions production base requirement as well as an economic point of view, of the facilitization of a second source for Load Assembly and Pack (LAP) of the CBU-87 Combined Effects Munition.

2. A requirement that the Secretary of Defense submit a report prior to October 1, 1984, as to the procedures required to permit allied or friendly nations, who so desire, to build diesel-electric submarines in American shipyards, provided that such submarines are built to foreign designs and are not constructed in Navy shipyards or in private shipyards currently constructing nuclear powered submarines for the United States Navy, and advise as to what procedures will be used to insure that modern submarine technology that is unique to American designed submarines and essential to the security of the United States is not compromised.

3. A comprehensive plan and funding profile for the required sensor update program and for the replacement of the present fleet of EP-3 aircraft with current production P-3C aircraft by March 1, 1984.

4. A comprehensive master plan for modernization and maintenance of the Navy's Air ASW forces, both in the active and reserve components, to be submitted in conjunction with the submission of the fiscal year 1986 defense budget request.

5. A report twice annually from the Secretary of the Army beginning January 1, 1885 for a period of 2 years on the status of procuring and fielding the Patriot missile system.

6. A report from the Secretary of Defense on the Divad after completion of the initial production testing before any fiscal year 1985 funds are obligated.

7. A report from the Department of the Navy by November 1, 1984 regarding alternative modernization programs for Naval Reserve Airlift.

8. A review by the Department of the Army of its requirements for Lighter, Air Cushion Vehicles.

9. A study from the Secretary of Defense by February 1, 1985 on future tactical mobility requirements, programs, and options.

10. A report from the Department of the Army by November 1, 1984 concerning the impact of the Talmadge Bridge in the Port of Savannah, Georgia on military transportation requirements.

11. A report from the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy detailing their plans to modernize the current inventory of Aggressor/Adversary aircraft.

12. A report by the Secretary of the Air Force before the end of fiscal year 1984 on the results of a comparative evaluation of a strategic weapons loader.

13. A requirement that the President submit an assessment of an additional factor (survivable basing) related to procurement of MX missiles.

14. A follow-on report from the Secretary of Defense on the role of Independent Cost Estimating in the acquisition process.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1. A report from the Department of Defense on current and potential exploitation of technology transfer from cooperative and non-cooperative sources.

2. A report from the Department of the Army by February 1, 1985 concerning the Army's long-range plans for light forces, including manning and equipping plans.

3. A requirement to make available $2 million to the private sector to develop initial contract plans and specifications to determine the feasibility of dual-use passenger/military multi-purpose vessels to be constructed in the United States to provide a cost effective approach to enhancing sealift and combat auxiliary capability, an interim report no later than November 15, 1984, and a final report not later than March 15, 1985 that discusses specific plans, specifications and approaches.

4. A requirement that the funds authorized for the MK-92 fire control system upgrade be utilized to proceed for the examination of the capabilities of the fixed, phased-array radar.

5. A requirement for the Secretary of the Navy to provide funding profile and schedule of events for the New Threat Upgrade program no later than two weeks after the submission of the fiscal year 1986 budget.

6. A requirement that all funds for the Manufacturing Technology program be considered minimum levels not subject to reduction in any manner.

7. A requirement that the contract for full scale engineering development of the CV ASW helicopter be signed no later than November 30, 1984.

8. A requirement that the Secretary of Defense submit a report validating the proposed missions and operational capabilities of the SSN-21 and compare them to the latest configuration of the Improved SSN-688 and previous SSN designs.

9. A requirement that the Secretary of the Navy make available detailed briefings on the alternative SSN designs that were considered in developing the SSN-21.

10. A requirement that a legislative Environmental Impact Statement supporting the small ICBM full scale development decision be submitted with the January 15, 1987 ICBM Modernization Progress Report pursuant to Section 1231(C)(1) of Public Law 98-94.

11. A report from the Department of Defense prior to February 1, 1985 on steps being taken in ICBM and SLBM programs to hedge against expanded Soviet ballistic missile defenses.

12. A report from the Secretary of Defense prior to expenditure of fiscal year 1985 funds for E-6A certifying commitment to E-6A procurement in the Five Year Plan, and providing an update of TACAMO Alternatives Study.

13. A report on satellite and ground network survivability prior to submission of fiscal year 1986 budget.

14. A report by February 1, 1985 on Soviet compliance with their commitments under the 1972 ABM Treaty.

15. A report from the Departments of Army, Navy and Air Force detailing their plans for incorporating On-board Oxygen Generating Systems (OBOGS) and On-board Inert Gas Generating Systems (OBIGGS) in military aircraft.

16. A report from the Secretary of the Navy detailing the cost, scope and schedule of developing an austere all-weather capability for the F/A-18.

17. A report from the Secretary of the Navy detailing plans for upgrading the A-6E.

18. A report from the Secretary of the Navy describing the impact of delaying the VTXTS IOC by 2 years.

19. A report from the Secretary of Defense dealing with Technology Base issues.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

1. An interim report from the Secretary of Defense by May 1, 1985 which describes and outlines the circumstances under which he has applied the general authorization contained in the bill to fund Joint Chiefs of Staff contingencies.

MANPOWER

1. A report by the Secretary of Defense on the current quality of each Service's enlisted force, the projected quality requirements for those forces over the next 5 years, and the ability of each Service to meet those quality requirements over the next 5 years.

2. A report by the Secretary of Defense on the adequacy of current career pay for aviation specialties, especially Aviation Career Incentive Pay, to meet the long-term career need of the Services.

3. A study by the Secretary of the Army of methods for paying members of the Army, including alternatives to an involuntary "sure pay" system.

4. A report by the Secretary of Defense on changes in patient workload and aggregate payment levels to various segments of the medical care provider community which are expected to result from the linkage of CHAMPUS with Medicare.

5. The findings and recommendations of a Blue Ribbon panel to be convened by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, on the present level of activity in the armed Services on the issues of wellness and health promotion.

6. A review, and resulting recommendations, by the Secretary of Defense on present policies and procedures utilized in the Services' drug abuse testing programs.

7. A study by the Secretary of Defense on post trial confinement procedures utilized by the armed Services, with explanation of differences in such procedures among the Services.

8. A report by the Secretary of the Navy on an on-going test program in the Navy and an on-going study in the Marine Corps of the establishment of separate defense counsel activities in those Services.

9. A report by the Department of Defense on the Department's current efforts to provide cultural orientation for U.S. personnel stationed abroad.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. A report by March 1, 1985 on atmospheric, climatic, environmental and biological consequences of nuclear war and the policy implications of such findings.

2. Annual classified and unclassified reports by the Secretary of Defense regarding the issues of allied contributions to Western defense, real growth in defense spending, and implementation of common defense commitments by NATO member nations and Japan.

TITLE I, PART A—PROCUREMENT

BACKGROUND ON PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

In 1959, section 338, title 10, United States Code, was amended by enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles and naval vessels. Over the years, the law has been amended to require annual authorization of additional items such as tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes and related support equipment, and various other weapons.

The committee and its various subcommittees held extensive hearings on the Department of Defense fiscal year 1985 request and related matters. Based on supporting testimony and other information provided to the committee, an exhaustive review to the many procurement programs and related requirements has been made. The committee's recommendations appear in subsequent pages of this report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING CHANGES

The tables below show comparisons of the amounts appropriated for procurement for fiscal year 1984 with amounts requested for authorization in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985 and those recommended by the committee.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 1985 PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION REQUEST: BY SERVICE

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year—		Committee	
	1984 budget authority	1985 request	Change from request	Recommendation
Army	$17,450,209	$21,059,800	−$1,143,100	$19,916,700
Navy and Marine Corps	31,478,036	37,199,441	−2,376,300	34,823,141
Air Force	36,120,485	48,058,600	−3,309,300	44,749,300
Defense agencies	947,157	1,243,500	−36,500	1,207,000
Total	85,995,887	107,561,341	−6,865,200	100,696,141

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Fixed wing:						
Airplane, reconnaissance, RC-12D	9	$79.3	−3	−$8.6	6	$70.7
Rotary:						
Helicopter, cargo, CH-47D (Chinook)	11	110.0			11	110.0
Helicopter electronic EH-60A (Quickfix) (MYP)	18	(203.2)		(−8.0)	18	(195.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−30.1)				(−30.1)
Net		173.1		−8.0		165.1
Helicopter electronic EH-60A (Quickfix) (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		27.2				27.2
AH-64 (Apache) attack helicopter	144	(1,260.8)			144	(1,260.8)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−61.6)				(−61.6)
		1,199.2				1,199.2
AH-64 (Apache) attack helicopter advance procurement (CY)		91.0				91.0
UH-60A (Black Hawk) (MYP)	78	(475.6)		(−23.8)	78	(451.8)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−142.6)				(−142.6)
Net		333.0		−23.8		309.2
UH-60A (Black Hawk) (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		171.8		−60.2		111.6
Total, aircraft		(2,184.6)		(−100.6)		(2,084.0)
Modification of aircraft:						
Airplane, surveillance, OV-1 (Mohawk)		21.8				21.8
Airplane, reconnaissance, RC-12D (GR PIP Mod)		7.8				7.8
Airplane, reconnaissance, RV-1 (Mod)		6.5				6.5
Helicopter, attack AH-1S (Cobra-TOW)		45.9		+30.0		75.9
AH-1 training device (Hitmore)		3.0				3.0
Helicopter, cargo, CH-47 (Chinook) (MYP)		(455.9)		(−15.0)		(440.9)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−168.9)				(−168.9)
Net		287.0		−15.0		272.0
Helicopter, cargo, CH-47 (Chinook) (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		159.9				159.9
Helicopter, electronic, EH-1 (Quick-Fix) Mod		2.2				2.2
Helicopter, observation, OH-58 (Kiowa)		4.0				4.0
Helicopter, utility, UH-1 (Iroquois)		1.9				1.9
UH-60A (Black Hawk) Mods		5.9				5.9
Army helicopter improvement program (AHIP)		(207.7)				(207.7)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−50.5)				(−50.5)
Net		157.2				157.2
Army helicopter improvement program (AHIP) advance procurement (CY)		60.1				60.1
Airborne avionics		7.0				7.0
Joint surveillance target attack radar		17.0		−17.0		0

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY—Continued

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Modifications under $900,000 (aircraft)		.1				.1
Acft 9WW		59.5				59.5
Total, modification of aircraft		(846.8)		(−2.0)		(844.8)
Spares and repair parts		633.4		−60.0		573.4
Support equipment and facilities:						
Avionics support equipment		51.6				51.6
Common ground equipment		31.9				31.9
Air traffic control		8.9				8.9
Synthetic flight training systems	8	175.2		−17.2	7	158.0
UH-60 Simulators		(71.0)		(−17.2)		(53.8)
Industrial facilities		72.3		−20.0		52.3
War consumables		3.6				3.6
Total, support equipment and facilities		(343.5)		(−37.2)		(306.3)
Total, aircraft procurement, Army		4,008.3		−199.8		3,808.5

CH-47C (CHINOOK)

The administration requested $110.0 million to procure 11 CH-47C Chinook helicopters built by an Italian firm, Augusta, for sale to Iran. The Italian government honored the U.S. government embargo of the delivery of these helicopters to Iran during the 1979-1980 hostage crisis and the U.S. government now proposes to purchase these helicopters from Italy.

A recent Army audit found the quality and workmanship of these aircraft to be "very good" and estimated the minimum cost to bring the aircraft up to U.S. hardware specifications to be approximately $1.0 million per aircraft. These aircraft could then be used to offset the current shortfall of CH-47's which is estimated to be in excess of 400 helicopters.

The committee notes that Italy is one of NATO's most unwavering members, and has, over the years, purchased a substantial amount of U.S. defense equipment. The United States, on the other hand, has purchased only very modest quantities of Italian made hardware. The current ratio of defense sales with Italy runs 10:1 in favor of the U.S. and is the least favorable of any NATO country except for the Netherlands.

The committee considers it essential, as a matter of keeping faith with a dependable ally, that the U.S. proceed with the purchase of these 11 helicopters. The committee therefore recommends the approval of the administration's request for the procurement of CH-47 helicopters manufactured in Italy.

AH-64 (APACHE) ATTACK HELICOPTER

The administration requested $1,199.2 million for the procurement of 144 AH-64 Apache helicopters in fiscal year 1985 and $91.1

million in advance procurement for 144 helicopters in fiscal year 1986.

The AH-64 is a highly mobile attack helicopter intended to be the Army's primary, quick, reacting airborne anti-tank weapon. Armed with Hellfire missiles, 2.75 inch rockets, a 30mm cannon and a very sophisticated mission equipment package, the Apache is capable of operating at night and in adverse weather with unprecedented effectiveness and survivability.

Two years ago in consideration of the fiscal year 1983 Defense Authorization request, the committee recommended a one year deferral of production start-up for the Apache. This recommendation was based on concern over the dramatic increase in the projected cost of the helicopter (procurement unit cost rose from $11.2 million to more than $16.0 million per aircraft in less than a year). Vigorous efforts on the part of both the Army and the manufacturer subsequently reduced the procurement unit cost to $14.2 million per helicopter where it has remained for the past two years.

One of the management efforts responsible for stabilizing the cost of the Apache was a revision in the production schedule. The revised schedule involves higher production rates (reaching a maximum of 144 per year rather than 96 as originally planned) and a compressed schedule (completing production in 1987 rather than 1988).

The administration's amended budget would reduce the Apache production rate in 1985 to 112 aircraft then level the rate at 96 per year for the next three years. This would add more than $1.2 million to the procurement unit cost of each helicopter.

While the committee understands the congressional pressure which led to the administration's proposal to stretch out the Apache program, it does not choose to follow that course. Instead, the committee believes that the current schedule should be retained.

Although it is too early to draw any meaningful conclusions (only 3 production aircraft have been delivered) it appears that management efforts to control costs while maintaining the revised production schedule have been successful. These developments are encouraging and argue in favor of not disturbing the current production schedule.

Consideration is being given by the Army to procuring more than the current inventory objective of 515 aircraft. The committee reserves judgment on such a proposal recognizing that no funds will be required to extend Apache production until fiscal year 1986. The committee's support for additional procurement of the Apache beyond 515 aircraft will be directly influenced by the price reductions achieved during the next two years of production. A significant reduction below the current cost projections would provide a strong incentive to extend production. The slightest cost growth above those estimates will preclude consideration of any additional procurement.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of AH-64 Apache helicopters.

UH-60 BLACKHAWK HELICOPTER

The administration requested $333.0 million for the procurement of 78 UH-60 helicopters in fiscal year 1985 and $171.8 million in advance procurement for 78 helicopters in fiscal year 1986.

The UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter is the Army's squad-carrying helicopter designed to lift an infantry squad of 11 combat-equipped soldiers in tactical assaults and related combat support missions.

The committee recommends a total reduction of $84.0 million from the administration's request distributed as follows:

Aircraft procurement

–$23.8 million—this savings (combined with $8.0 million in the EH-60A program) results from favorable negotiations for the second UH-60 multi-year contract (fiscal year 1985-1987).

Advance procurement

–$39.1 million—this savings results from shifting the multi-year payment schedule from the current policy of funding full termination liability to funding only actual expenditures.

–$21.1 million—this savings results from waiving the requirement for a warranty on the UH-60. The Army has determined that at $21.1 million, such a warranty is not cost-effective.

The committee recommends authorization of $309.2 million for the procurement of 78 aircraft in 1985 and $111.6 million in advance procurement for 78 aircraft in 1986. The committee recommends approval of a multi-year contract for the UH-60 Blackhawk.

EH-60 QUICK FIX II

The administration requested $173.1 million for the procurement of 18 EH-60A aircraft and $27.2 million in advance procurement for 18 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The EH-60 Quick Fix II is an ECM/ESM (Electronic Countermeasures/Electromagnetic Support Measures) system intended to provide tactical signal intelligence and electronic warfare support to Army units. The EH-60A, Quick Fix II, will replace the EH-1X Quick Fix system based in Europe. Quick Fix II will provide division level forces with their primary source of airborne electronic countermeasures, intercept, and radio direction funding.

The EH-60A mission electronics are configured in a standard UH-60A Blackhawk helicopter which are purchased on a firm fixed-price, multi-year basis as part of the Blackhawk multi-year contract.

As a result of the success of the first Blackhawk multi-year contract (fiscal years 1982-1984), the Army has identified an additional savings of $8.0 million available in the fiscal year 1985 request for the EH-60A. The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $165.1 million for the procurement of 18 EH-60A aircraft in 1985 and $27.2 million in advance procurement for 18 aircraft in 1986, a net reduction of $8.0 million from the administration's request.

AH-1S COBRA MODS

The administration requested $45.9 million for modifications to the AH-1S Cobra fleet. The committee recommends an additional authorization of $30.0 million to modify Army National Guard AH-1G helicopters to the upgraded AH-1S configuration.

The committee recommends authorization of $75.9 million for AH-1 Cobra modifications.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)-OV-1

The administration requested $17.0 million for the procurement of an Army platform for the Joint Suveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems (JSTARS). The Army intended to install the JSTARS radar on an OV-1 Mohawk aircraft.

Subsequent to the submission of the fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization Request, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force agreed that a single platform type would be used to provide both the Air Force and Army with standoff targeting information. The platform selected was the Air Force C-18 (a used Boeing 707).

The committee commends the Army and Air Force for this cooperative, cost-effective approach to meeting a very important requirement. Since the agreement is to use a common Air Force platform, funds requested for the OV-1 JSTARS will not be required. The committee therefore recommends that no funds be authorized for the procurement of an Army JSTARS OV-1.

ARMY AIRCRAFT SPARES

The administration requested $633.4 million for the procurement of spares and repair parts for Army aircraft.

The committee notes that as a result of delays in the obligation rate of funds authorized and appropriated in prior years, a significant amount of funds remains to be obligated for the procurement of spare parts. The committee therefore recommends an undistributed reduction of $60.0 million from the administration's request for aircraft spare parts in fiscal year 1985. The committee recommends an authorization of $573.4 million for the procurement of Army Aircraft Spares and Repairs Parts in fiscal year 1985.

SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

The administration requested $343.5 million for the procurement of Army aviation support equipment and facilities. The committee recommends an authorization of $306.3 million, a reduction of $37.2 million from the administration's request. The committee recommends the following distribution of this reduction:

Program	Fiscal year 1985 request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
UH-60 simulators	71.0	53.8	-17.2
Industrial facilities	72.3	52.3	-20.0

These reductions are strictly the result of congressional budgetary pressure and are made without prejudice. Should the Army wish to transfer funds from lower priority programs to those which have been reduced, they are invited to submit a reprograming request.

ARMY AIRCRAFT, ON/BOARD INERT GAS GENERATING SYSTEM (OBIGGS)

The Army has shown interest in the OBIGGS system for several years. The system offers enhanced operational readiness and safety by providing a rapidly available source of insert gas to replace the ambient air in fuel cells. Though the system has shown promise, the Army's plans for incorporating OBIGGS in its aircraft are not clear.

The committee requests the Army provide a report detailing the Army's plans, including projected funding, for the OBIGGS system in Army aircraft. This report shall include a statement of the Army's assessment of potential long term (10 year) cost benefits of the system, if any, and shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services by January 1, 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Surface-to-air missile system:						
Chaparral				+32.0		$32.0
Other missile support		$17.3				17.3
Patriot	585	1,096.4	−145	−$120.0	440	976.4
Stinger	2,360	209.6			2,360	209.6
Air-to-surface missile system:						
Laser Hellfire system	6,026	235.0			6,026	235.0
Anti-Tank/assault missile system:						
TOW 2 (MYP)	18,000	240.3		+53.2	18,000	293.5
TOW 2 (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		25.0				25.0
Pershing	93	456.0	−23	−69.0	70	387.0
Multiple launch rocket system (MYP)	50,472	(459.2)			50,472	(459.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−55.2)				(−55.2)
Net		404.0				404.0
Multiple launch rocket system (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		137.4				137.4
Total, other missiles		(2,821.0)		(−103.8)		(2,717.2)
Modification of missiles:						
Patriot		11.8				11.8
Chaparral		106.2				106.2
Hawk		58.1				58.1
TOW		17.9		+9.6		27.5
LCSS		3.8				3.8
AN/TSQ 73		11.4				11.4
Total, modification of missiles		(209.2)		(+9.6)		(218.8)
Spares and repair parts		289.7		−19.4		270.3
Patriot		(106.0)		(−21.0)		(85.0)
TOW		(3.5)		(+5.6)		(9.1)
Pershing II		(16.2)		(−4.0)		(12.2)
Support equipment and facilities:						
Air defense targets		20.8				20.8
Items less than $900,000 (missiles)		6.6				6.6
Production base support		56.5				56.5
Other production charges		38.6				38.6
Total, support equipment and facilities		(122.5)				(122.5)
Total, missile procurement, Army		3,442.4		−113.6		3,328.8

CHAPARRAL

The Chaparral is the Army's Short Range Air Defense (SHORAD) missile system. It consists of a launcher mounted on a M-370 tracked vehicle carrying four missiles on the launch rails and eight additional missiles in storage compartments for reload. The last procurement of missiles for this system occurred in fiscal year 1979. Future procurements would provide greater immunity to enemy countermeasures, provide fire units to support the National Guard air defense modernization program, and support requirements of Army light forces. Chaparral is currently co-deployed with the self-propelled Vulcan gun to provide air defense for infantry, mechanized infantry and armored divisions, and critical corps and theatre rear area assets, to include air bases.

Although no funds were requested to procure Chaparral systems in fiscal year 1985, the Army outlined plans to procure 300 Chaparral systems at a cost of $152.3 million in fiscal year 1986, including $19.4 million for Chaparral test equipment and $40 million for towed Chaparrals for Army National Guard units.

The majority of the eight Army National Guard Air Defense Battalions are equipped with 1950-vintage, twin 40-millimeter Duster air defense guns. These systems are not adequate to meet the sophisticated air defense challenge of the 1980s and 1990s. The Army, in recognition of the importance of National Guard Air Defense Battalions as an integral component of the total force, recently increased Chaparral inventory objectives for National Guard Air Defense. Further, the Army has informed the committee of its acquisition program to meet these new inventory objectives.

The committee believes, however, that because selected National Guard units will be among the first to be deployed in the event of a conflict, the Army's Chaparral program to equip the National Guard should be accelerated.

The committee recommends authorization of a total of $32 million—$24 million to procure 12 Chaparral fire units and $8 million for associated support equipment for the Army National Guard.

PATRIOT

The administration requested $1,096.4 million for the procurement of 585 missiles and 15 Patriot fire units. The budget request also contained $106.0 million for initial spares.

Patriot is a high and medium air defense missile system being produced as a replacement for Hercules and Improved Hawk. The missile is designed to require no field maintenance. The system employs a unique concept known as track-via-missile that provides greatly increased accuracy. It is capable of multiple simultaneous engagement of attacking aircraft using sophisticated electronic countermeasures. The mission of the Patriot missile system is to provide high to medium altitude, radar directed air defense to the field Army.

The committee was informed that the Patriot program has experienced technical and training difficulties which have led to about a six-month schedule slip in the program. Although the Department of the Army has restructured the Patriot program to recover from the delay in the schedule and experts to start follow-on evaluation this spring, the committee believes that the proposed recovery schedule is overly optimistic. Therefore, the committee believes that authorizing a level production rate at the fiscal year 1984 rate of 12 fire units and 440 missiles would be prudent. This action would remove the scheduling risk but would not significantly impact deployment plans.

The committee, therefore, recommends authorization of $976.4 million to procure 12 fire units and 440 missiles and authorizes $85 million for Patriot spare parts. This represents a reduction of $120 million for Patriot and $21 million for spares.

The committee believes that, with the developmental problems experienced by Patriot to date, it would be prudent to get regular reports on the progress of Patriot for the next two years. The Secretary of the Army is directed to report formally to the committee twice annually beginning January 1, 1985 for a period of two years on the status of procurement and fielding of this system. The committee is particularly concerned with the follow-on evaluation test and the deployment of the system to Europe—both of which are scheduled in the next few months. The committee expects the Army to develop distinct milestones for fielding the Patriot system and reports should cover progress against those milestones.

HELLFIRE MISSILE

The administration requested $235.0 million for the procurement of 6,026 Hellfire missiles.

The Hellfire is a helicopter fired, laser guided missile intended for deploypment as the primary anti-armor weapon system on the Army's AH-64 Apache helicopter.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of Hellfire missiles.

TOW 2

The administration requested $240.3 million to procure 18,000 TOW 2 missiles, $3.5 million for TOW 2 spares, and $25.0 million for advance procurement to support production surge requirements.

TOW is a tube-launched, optically-tracked, wire-guided heavy antitank/assault weapon system, consisting of a launcher, missile, and various ground support equipment for maintenance, testing, and training. The system is being upgraded by modifying and retrofitting components and providing an improved missile with an enhanced warhead to defeat the anticipated armor threat.

In the President's fiscal year 1984 budget, $28.2 million was requested to procure hardware and production tooling to support an anticipated production surge requirement of 3,500 TOW 2 missiles a month. This request was denied. Again, this year the Army has requested $25 million to support TOW 2 production surge requirements of 3,500 missiles a month. The Army has indicated it plans to request $28 million next year to procure hardware and complete the production tooling to support TOW 2 surge requirements.

The budget request also contains a proposal for a five-year multiyear procurement for the TOW 2. The department indicates that this multi-year procurement would result in a savings of $117.7 million.

The Army has indicated its desire to transfer $68.4 million from the funds requested in Other Procurement, Army, account—communications and electronics equipment—to procure the enhanced TOW 2 night sight (AN/TAS-4A) out of the TOW 2 missile procurement account instead of the Other Procurement, Army. Consequently, authorization for TOW 2 missile procurement is increased by $53.2 million, the authorization for Army missile spares is increased by $5.6 million and authorization for the TOW 2 modification line is increased by $9.6 million. The appropriate transfer language and adjustments are reflected in the Other Procurement, Army, account.

In summary, the committee recommends approval of the authorization for 18,000 missiles as recommended in the President's original budget. In addition, the committee has transferred funding authority for the AN/TAS-4A TOW 2 night sight to the TOW 2 missile procurement account and the request for multi-year procurement is approved.

PERSHING II

The administration requested a total of $472.2 million, including initial spares, to procure 93 Pershing II missiles.

The Pershing II is a two stage, solid propellant missile with greater range and accuracy than the P-Ia system that it will replace. The Pershing II was initially deployed in November 1983, in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). Follow-on deployments in the FRG are planned over the next several years. Pershing II deployments are subject to modification, cancellation or reversal if a successful Intermediate Range Nuclear Force (INF) agreement is reached with the Soviet Union.

The fiscal year 1984 Defense Appropriations Act provided funding for the procurement of 95 missiles. It now appears, however, that only 70 missiles can be procured with fiscal year 1984 funds because of increased costs associated with a change in the acquisition strategy, a failure to achieve projected savings from new manufacturing technologies and from negotiations, and unanticipated contractor overhead costs.

Due to fiscal year 1985 budget constraints, the committee recommends that the procurement rate established in fiscal year 1984 be continued into fiscal year 1985. The committee, therefore, recommends that the request for 93 missiles be reduced to 70 missiles, and that the associated funding for missiles and spares be reduced by $73.0 million. The committee strongly supports the ongoing modernization of NATO's intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), and U.S. efforts to negotiate an INF arms reduction agreement. The committee believes that these deployments provide an important incentive for the Soviets to negotiate seriously. The committee recommends these reductions in the Pershing II program with the understanding that they will have no adverse impact on the planned deployment schedule.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Tracked combat vehicles:						
Carrier, command post light, ft, M577A2	167	$33.4			167	$33.4
Carrier, personnel, ft, arm, M113	50	8.9			50	89
Bradley fighting vehicles (MYP)	710	(1,027 0)	−55	(−$45.9)	655	(981.1)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−29.6)				(−29.6)
Net		997.4		−45.9		951.5
Bradley fighting vehicles (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		59.0		−34.1		24.9
Bradley FVS training devices		56.5				56.5
Field artillery ammunition support vehicles	170	84.2			170	84.2
Howitzer, med sp, ft, 155MM, 109A2	70	52.4			70	52.4
Recovery vehicle, med, ft, M88A1	180	159.4			180	159.4
Tank, M1 series (MYP)	720	(1,760.2)		(−150.0)	720	(1,610.2)
Less: advance procurement (PY)		(−290.8)				(−290.8)
Net		1,469.4	0	−150.0		1,319.4
Prior year authorization transfer				(+150.0)		(150.0)
Tank, M1 Series (MYP) advance procurement (CY		289.4				289.4
M60 series tank training devices		25.7		−7.0		18.7
M1 series tank training devices		37.1				37.1
Modification of tracked combat vehicles:						
Carrier, mod		34.8				34.8
FIST vehicle (mod)		79.5				79.5
BFVS series		3.9				3.9
Howitzer, med sp ft, 155 MM, M109 Ser (Mod)		33.8				33.8
Armored veh launch bridge (AVLB) (Mod)		15.4				15.4
Tank, combat, ft, 105MM gun, M60 series (Mod) (MYP)		215.1				215.1
105MM tank gun (mod)		3.0				3.0
Tank, M1 series (mod)		8.0				8.0
Improved TOW vehicle				+27.0		27.0
Support equipment and facilities:						
Spares and repair parts		430.1		−4.0		426.1
Bradley FVS		(64.4)		(−4.0)		(60.4)
Value engineeing		1.0				1.0
Items less than $900,000 (TCV–WTCV)		.9				.9
Production base support		58.3				58.3
Total, tracked combat vehicles		(4,156.6)		(−214.0)		(3,942.6)
Weapons and other combat vehicles:						
Sergeant York DIVAD gun	132	(538.6)	−15	(−77.3)	117	(461.3)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−22.8)				(−22.8)
Net		515.8		−77.3		438.5
Prior year authorization transfer				(+41.7)		(41.7)
Sergeant York DIVAD gun advance procurement (CY)		12.9		−2.4		10.5

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Armor machine gun, 7.62MM, M240	4,766	25.4			4,766	25.4
Squad automatic weapon (SAW) 5.56MM	3,800	12.9			3,800	12.9
Grenade launcher, auto, 40MM, MK19-3	340	4.5			340	4.5
Launcher, smoke grenade	5,526	4.8			5.526	4.8
Mortar, 81MM, XM252	441	11.3	−441	−11.3		
M16A2 rifle	75,000	39.6			75,000	39.6
Personal defense weapon, 9MM	14,650	5.0	−14,650	−5.0		
Veh rapid fire wpn sys-Bushmaster (MYP)	755	48.0	−65	−4.2	690	43.8
Veh rapid fire wpn sys-Bushmaster (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		8.1				8.1
Tank muzzle boresight device		3.8				3.8
Modification of weapons and other combat vehicles:						
Product improved Vulcan ads (PIVADS)		33.2		−30.0		3.2
Modifications under $900,000 (WOCV-WTCV)		1.0				1.0
Support equipment and facilities:						
Spares and repair parts		119.3		−10.5		108.8
Sergeant York DIVAD gun		(92.800)		(−10.5)		(82.3)
Items less than $900,000 (WOCV-WTCV)		2.7				2.7
Production Base Support (WOCV-WTCV)		87.8				87.8
Total, weapons and other combat vehicles		(936.1)		(−140.7)		(795.4)
Total, procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army		5,092.7		−354.7		4,738.0

BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE

The administration requested $997.4 million to procure 710 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, $59 million for advance procurement to support 900 vehicles in fiscal year 1986, and $64.4 million for spares.

The Bradley Fighting Vehicles include the Infantry Fighting Vehicle (IFV) and the Cavalry Fighting Vehicle (CFV). There are minor internal differences in the vehicles for crew size and storage to optimize each vehicle for its mission requirements. The IFV/CFV will provide mechanized infantry and scouts of armored cavalry the necessary mobility, firepower and survivability to operate on the modern battlefield and to accomplish reconnaissance and security missions. The mission of the IFV is to provide cross-country mobility and vehicular mounted firepower able to support mechanized infantry operations in mounted and dismounted combat.

The committee continues its strong support for this important weapon system. Its mobility, armored protection, agility and antitank capacity enhances the survivability and, thus, the battlefield utility of the vehicle.

As part of the President's program to reduce the deficit, the Defense Department proposed to cut Bradley procurement from 710 vehicles to 655 vehicles, reducing the budget by $88.2 million as shown in the above table. The committee reluctantly accepts the proposal of the Defense Department.

ABRAMS TANK

The administration requested $1,469.4 million to procure 720 M-1 tanks in fiscal year 1985, $289.4 million for advance procurement to support the procurement of 720 tanks in fiscal year 1986, and $27.2 million for spares.

The M-1 tank is a highly mobile combat vehicle with significantly improved survivability provided by improved ballistic protection and compartmentalization. The M-1 tank initially mounted a 105mm gun, but all tanks requested in fiscal year 1985 will mount the 120mm gun as part of the M-1E1 enhancement program. Improved day and night fire control and shoot-on-the-move capabilities, higher cross-country speeds and faster acceleration will make the M-1 tank a more difficult target for opposing ground and air forces.

The fiscal year 1985 request represents the sixth year of production for the M-1 tank. The committee was informed that over the last 12 months the program has met or exceeded its planned monthly tank delivery schedule with the hardware unit cost decreasing by $240,000. The M-1 tank program has clearly matured with over 3,000 tanks procured.

As part of the President's effort to reduce the deficit, the Secretary of Defense recommended reducing tank production to 600 tanks for fiscal year 1985 and reducing the funding request by $253.5 million. The committee feels that such a reduction is not prudent in view of production levels in fiscal years 1983 and 1984 and has, therefore, maintained production at 720 tanks as requested. The committee has taken advantage of unused prior year authorization and proceeds from foreign military sales of M-48 tanks in fiscal year 1983 to reduce the amount requested by $150 million. This leaves sufficient prior year savings to permit the Army to pursue second sourcing of the M-1 engine.

Another issue of concern to the committee is the continuing controversy over AGT 1500 engines for the M-1 tank. Last year the Congress directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct an independent study on the feasibility and cost effectiveness of establishing a second production source or multi-year procurement of the AGT 1500 engine for the M-1 tank. Further, the Secretary was directed to have the Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG) review and analyze the results of the study to aid to validate projected savings of the proposed procurement strategies.

The Department has accomplished that study and has concluded that developing a second turbine engine source is cost effective. The letter from the Secretary of Defense follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1984.

Hon. JOHN G. TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN. Public Law 98-212, dated December 8, 1983, directed that within three months after enactment of this act the Secretary of Defense would conduct a study to determine whether it was in the national interest to establish a second production source or multiyear procurement of the AGT 1500 engine for the M-1 tank, and based upon this study to report the Secretary of Defense determination on this issue.

The Army's Second Source Study Report has been submitted to your committee. The Department of Defense (DoD) position was included in Dr. DeLauer's testimony to the HASC on March 29, 1984, a copy of which is attached. The DoD recommended seeking full variable quantity bids for dual sourcing the engine on a yearly competition. This would put the government in a position to compete the engine for as long as we are going to build M-1 engines. Initial analysis, backed up with partial bid data, indicates that with full variable quantity annual competition the total engine cost would be less than the current multiyear sole source bid, and would provide the attendant advantages of competition to the DoD. These advantages include increased management attention by the contractors which inherently yields better cost and quality control. Further, competition will provide better prices for future production and spare parts in the 1990's. A copy of this letter has also been sent to Members of Congress Price, Addabbo, and Stevens.

Sincerely,

CASPAR WEINBERGER.

The committee concurs in the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense and urges the Army to proceed toward that end. A provision has been added to the bill repealing section 107 of the fiscal year 1984 Department of Defense Authorization Act which prohibited the establishment of a second source for the M-1 engine.

In summary the committee recommends authorization of $1,319.4 million to procure 720 tanks, $289.4 million for advance procurement for 720 M-1 tanks in fiscal year 1986, and $27.2 million for spares. Further, the committee authorizes the transfer of $89.5 million from prior year authorizations and $60.5 million from the proceeds of foreign military sales of M-48 tanks to support M-1 tank procurement in fiscal year 1985.

M-60 TRAINING DEVICES

The administration requested $25.7 million to procure 12 M-60 training devices. These devices permit the training of tank crews in simulators saving training costs.

As part of the President's effort to reduce the deficit, the Defense Department identified $7.0 million in this procurement that could be withdrawn without affecting the planned buy. The committee agrees with the Department's proposal.

IMPROVED TOW VEHICLE

The Improved TOW Vehicle is designed to enhance the Army's antitank capability. It combines the TOW missile system on the M-113 Armored Personnel Carrier.

The last procurement of ITV was authorized in fiscal year 1983. The Army advised the committee of its plans to resume production of the ITV in fiscal year 1986 to begin providing vehicles to early deploying National Guard units. The committee believes that this system is of sufficient priority to add $27.0 million for the production of 138 ITVs for the National Guard.

DIVISION AIR DEFENSE GUN (DIVAD)

The administration requested $515.8 million to procure 132 Division Air Defense (DIVAD) guns, $12.9 million for advance procurement to support the procurement of 144 DIVAD guns in fiscal year 1986, and $92.8 million for initial spares.

The Division Air Defense gun is a self-propelled medium caliber air defense gun. Specifically, it is a short range, fast reaction air defense system consisting of twin 40mm guns, acquisition and search radars, and a turret mounted on a M48A5 tank chassis. It provides increased kill probability, effective range, reliability and mobility over the Vulcan Air Defense System now in use by the Army. The DIVAD system would be employed in air defense artillery battalions of the armored and mechanized divisions, the Corps air defense artillery group, and armored cavalry units.

The committee remains a strong supporter of the DIVAD gun because it believes the self-propelled Vulcans presently in the active force heavy divisions must be replaced. The committee notes that the cost history of the DIVAD program is impressive. The original procurement unit cost estimate in constant fiscal year 1978 dollars was $3.31 million while the current procurement unit cost in constant fiscal year 1978 dollars is $3.17 million—$140,000 or four percent below the original procurement unit cost estimates.

Although the committee continues to support the DIVAD program, it notes that the program is experiencing the normal "growing pains" as it transitions into full rate production. Consequently, the program production schedule has been delayed by about eight months. The committee has been advised that the Army has developed a plan to recover from this schedule delay within the next 18 months. The committee, however, believes that the planned recovery schedule is unnecessarily ambitious and that a more deliberate and conservative recovery schedule is advisable.

In reviewing this issue and suggesting a more conservative recovery schedule, the committee notes that last year when the Congress authorized appropriations to procure 130 DIVAD guns, the Army indicated that the present DIVAD contract contained a provision that allows a variation in contract quantity of as much as 10 percent without incurring cost penalties. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to exercise that contract provision permitting the procurement of 117 DIVADs in fiscal year 1984—a reduction of 13 DIVADs—without any cost penalties. This reduction would result in a fiscal year 1984 program savings of $41.7 million, including contract savings of $31.7 million, $8.7 million savings in spares, and $1.3 million savings in advance procurement.

Regarding the fiscal year 1985 request, the committee believes that stabilizing production at the fiscal year 1984 production rate of 117 DIVADs for fiscal year 1985 and beyond is advisable. This would result in a fiscal year 1985 quantity reduction of 15 DIVADs and a savings of $35.6 million, a $2.4 million production in advance procurement and a $10.5 million reduction in spares.

As part of the President's effort to reduce the deficit, the Defense Department offered the reduction to DIVAD suggested in the discussion above, except that the Defense Department did not propose to trim the fiscal year 1984 production by 10 percent, as the committee is inclined to do. The committee is also concerned that the "growing pains" do not represent major technological flaws that cannot be fixed. Therefore, the committee recommends that the production authorized for fiscal year 1985 be "fenced" until the completion of initial production testing and the submission of a report on that testing by the Secretary of Defense with his judgment that proceeding with the production of DIVAD is appropriate.

The committee, therefore, recommends authorization of $438.5 million to procure 117 DIVAD guns, $10.5 million for advance procurement, and $82.3 million for spares. The committee also authorizes the transfer of $41.7 million from DIVAD prior year authorizations to support DIVAD procurement in fiscal year 1985 and the recommended authorization of $438.5 million reflects this transfer. Utilizing the $41.7 million available from fiscal year 1984, the overall authorization recommended for fiscal year 1985 is $90.2 million below the amount requested.

MORTAR, 81MM

The administration requested $11.3 million to procure 441 81-millimeter mortars.

The improved 81mm consist of a United Kingdom barrel with a blast attenuation device (BAD) mount and a U.S. base plate. The fire control components include the U.S. self-illuminating sight unit, aiming post lights, and the lightweight aluminum aiming post.

The Army program for the development and fielding of mortar systems is in disarray. The committee understands that a comprehensive mortar study is underway within the Army and that results of this study should be available in a few months. Given the state of the mortar program, the committee has denied all funding for R&D and procurement of new mortars. The committee does not want this action to be interpreted as a bias against mortar systems; to the contrary, the committee believes that the Army has not placed the proper emphasis on mortars and the capability that they bring to both infantry and mechanized units.

The committee urges the Army not to enter a major mortar R&D programs to reinvent available mortar technology. "Smart" mortar munitions, on the other hand, do hold some potential and the committee will support funding in that area.

Light mortars (60mm and 81mm) are significant firepower additions to light infantry and the committee feels that the Army should carefully consider including such firepower—using off-the-shelf technology for the new light divisions.

Heavy mortars, especially the 120mm mortar, now used by many of our allies have excellent potential for expanded firepower capability. The committee is aware that there are many users within the Army who support procuring the 120mm mortar to replace the 4.2 inch mortar now in the Army inventory. The committee urges the Army to give serious consideration to adopting the 120mm mortar to replace the 4.2 inch mortar and would entertain a reprograming request toward that end if the Army study supports such an option.

Although the committee supports the 81mm program, it believes that the program should be deferred until the Army has submitted its comprehensive long-range mortar plan.

PISTOL, 9MM

The administration requested $5 million to procure 14,650 9mm pistols for the Army. The Congress denied the Army's request for a new pistol last year because it felt that the cost for a new pistol was excessive and that a new pistol was not a high priority defense requirement. The committee continues to believe that a new pistol is of such low priority that any replacement program should be deferred for the indefinite future.

PRODUCT IMPROVED VULCAN AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (PIVADS)

The administration requested $33.2 million for the Product Improved VULCAN Air Defense System (PIVADS).

The primary objective of the VULCAN Air Defense System Effectiveness Product Improvement is to increase tracking and gun pointing accuracies; and the secondary objective is to simplify maintenance. This will be accomplished by replacing the present sighting system with a more effective sighting system that provides for radar-aided tracking, upgrading fire control electronics, and implementing built-in test equipment throughout the fire control system.

In fiscal year 1984, the budget request contained $9.3 million for Product Improved VULCAN Air Defense Systems (PIVADS). However, the Congress appropriated $38.3 million for this important weapon system, indicating the broad congressional support the PIVADS program enjoys.

There are currently 600 VULCAN systems (221 towed and 379 self-propelled) in the inventory. Once the PIVAD systems are delivered to the active forces, the self-propelled VULCAN systems will be transferred to National Guard units. Therefore, PIVADS would benefit both active and reserve components. consequently, the committee has been and continues to be a very strong supporter of the PIVADS program. However, the Army has informed the committee that because of insufficient test range time, the program has been delayed. This delay means that the contract for the fiscal year 1985 buy would not be negotiated until about November 1985. therefore, at present, the funds requested are not needed. The committee recommends, therefore, authorization of $3.2 million for the PIVADS program, a reduction of $30 million. Further, the committee notes that if there is a change in the program testing status and the Army desires to accelerate the program, it would consider a reprograming request.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Ammunition		2,191.8		+2.8		2,194.6
Cartridge, 5.56 mm blank	118,375	(13.3)		(+1.6)		(14.9)
Cartridge, 9 mm ball (hand gun)	6,502	(1.4)		(−1.4)		(0)
Ctg, Cal. 50, ball Lkd & Ctn	2,198	(3.1)		(+1.0)		(4.1)
Ctg, Cal. 50 blk, M1A1, Lkd F/M2MG (MYP)	17,453	(13.9)		(+3.4)		(17.3)
Ctg, Cal. 50, tracer, linked	791	(1.7)		(+1.1)		(2.8)
Ctg, 81 mm, improved training, full range	94	(7.9)		(−7.9)		(0)
Ctg, 20 mm, TP–T		(0)		(+8.0)		(8.0)
Ctg, 25 mm, TP–T		(0)		(+21.0)		(21.0)
Ctg, TP–T for DIVAD gun, SGT York	381	(29.3)		(−15.5)		(13.8)
Ctg, 40 mm, HE w/prox fuze for DIVAD gun	220	(48.0)		(−3.5)		(44.5)
Ctg, 40 mm, practice low velocity	3,210	(6.7)		(−2.3)		(4.4)
Ctg, 4.2 inch, smoke, WP	79	(10.2)		(−10.2)		(0)
Ctg, 120 mm, APFSDS–T XM829	10	(20.9)		(+10.0)		(30.9)
Projectile, 155 MM, HE RAAMS M718 (MYP)	16	(30.2)		(−30.2)		(0)
Projectile, 155 MM, HE Copperhead (EA)	2,253	(102.8)		(+32.3)		(135.1)
Projectile, 155 MM, SMK, WP, M825	15	(12.5)		(12.0)		(24.5)
Projectile, 155 MM, chem GB–2 advance procurement (CY)		(13.0)		(−13.0)		(0)
Charge, propelling, 155 mm, white bag, M4	990	(44.9)		(−5.0)		(39.9)
Light anti-tank weapon: tactical	29	(33.8)		(+7.8)		(41.6)
Hand grenades, all types		(14.1)		(−1.4)		(12.7)
9th ID high technology test bed (HTTB)		(5.0)		(−5.0)		(0)
Ammunition production base support		302.2		+18.0		320.2
Provision of industrial facilities		(240.2)		(+60.0)		(300.2)
Chemical production capability		(42.0)		(−42.0)		(0)
Total, procurement of ammunition, Army		2,494.0		+20.8		2,514.8

The administration requested $2,494.0 million for procurement of ammunition in support of the Army's training war reserve and production base requirements.

The request is approximately 20 percent above the fiscal year 1984 approved program and thus provides for approximately 14 percent growth in real terms.

However, in the view of this committee the growth is based on a program which has been repeatedly underfunded. The fiscal year 1984 request was $292 million below that of the fiscal year 1983 request. Consequently, real growth in the fiscal year 1984 request is only the result of a 20-percent congressional reduction in the fiscal year 1983 program.

Substantial growth in the ammunition request is repeatedly postponed to the out-years. For example, the fiscal year 1985 column of the fiscal year 1984 request for ammunition and production base totaled $3,404.2 million but the fiscal year 1985 request totaled only $2494.0; a reduction of $910.2 million.

The committee remains concerned that current trends in ammunition procurement and ammunition production base support provide an insufficient base from which to achieve training, war reserve and production capacity objectives.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,514.8 million, a growth of $20.8 million from the budget request. This modest increase will increase the capacity of the production base and increase the level of procurement of training ammunition.

DOD BUDGET REVISIONS

On May 3, 1984, as part of the administration's deficit reduction effort, the Department of Defense forwarded to the Congress a revision of the fiscal year 1985 request which reduced the Army Ammunition request from a Total Obligation Authority of $2,191.8 to $2,006.7, a reduction of $185.1 million.

With regard to several of the programs, the committee concurs with the reductions. They were the subject of critical reports by the GAO and others and most were recommended for reduction by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. These programs include the following:

Line item	Budget request	DOD proposed change	Committee recommendation
Charge propelling 155mm	44.9	−17.8	[1] 39.9
Ctg, 105mm, TPCSDS-T	48.0	−48.0	0
Ctg, TP-T for DIVAD	29.3	−15.5	13.8
Ctg, 40mm, HEW/PROX	48.0	−3.5	44.5
Ctg, 5.56mm plastic	1.3	−1.3	0
Projectile, 155mm RAAMS	30.2	−30.2	0
Ctg, 81mm, improved tng	7.9	7.9	0
9th Inf Div ADEA	5.0	−5.0	0

[1] Additional adjustments made by committee.

The committee does not agree with the following proposed reductions:

Line item	Budget request	DOD proposed change	Committee recommendation
Ctg, 5.56mm ball	57.2	−22.1	57.2
Ctg, 7.62mm ball	9.9	−9.9	9.9
Ctg, Cal. 50 4 ball-1 tracer	15.1	−7.8	15.1
Ctg, 105mm, TPCSDS-T	48.0	−48.0	48.0
Ctg, 105mm, TP-T	72.5	−9.4	72.5
Ctg, Cal. 50 plastic	6.7	−6.7	6.7

The production of the 5.56 round is barely adequate to meet minimum requirements. Ammunition is being shipped directly from the production sites to the using units. The remaining items are required for adequate training resources.

TRAINING AMMUNITION

In recent years the Army has refined the calculations upon which request for training ammunition is based. As a result of the "Standard in Training Commission" (STRAC) and other studies, the minimum ammunition requirement for the conduct of training and the impact of insufficient training ammunition has been more accurately determined. The effect of STRAC has been to reduce the training requirements for live and/or large caliber ammunition.

Despite this, the fiscal year 1985 request for training ammunition remained far below the newly established requirement. Including the on-hand ammunition available for training, the funds requested for training ammunition for fiscal year 1985 provided only 73 percent of the recognized requirement. While the fiscal year 1985 request for training ammunition exceeds the amount appropriated for fiscal years 1983 and 1984, the improvement is insufficient.

Based upon these deficiencies, the committee recommends adjustment of the DOD request as previously noted. The committee also recommends addition of $58.1 million for several ammunition types and calibers to help meet critical training shortfalls. Major examples include 5.56mm blank for SAW, caliber .50 ball and tracer, linked, 20mm TP-T, 25mm TPT and 120mm APFSDS-T tank ammunition.

The committee estimates that these recommended adjustments will provide for approximately 80 percent of the Army's requirement for training ammunition, rather than the 73 percent of requirement contained in the request.

FUSE, HAND GRENADE PRACTICE

The Army has reduced its planned procurement for fical year 1985 to a quantity of 1,189,000 which will meet the fiscal year 1985 inventory objective.

Consequently, the committee recommends authorization of $12.7 million.

ANTI-ARMOR INITIATIVE

During the past two decades, the capabilities of Soviet armored forces have increased dramatically. In addition to substantial growth from a large base, the modernization of tanks, fighting vehicles, artillery and support elements has given them the capability to conduct rapid, deep and sustained combined arms operations.

Their tactics emphasize tank and armored vehicle combined arms forces, relying on speed and maneuver to penetrate through gaps, weak points, and around open flanks to seize and destroy key objectives and to disrupt movement of reserve forces.

With these capabilities in mind, the committee is very concerned about deficiencies in the ability of the U.S. infantryman to counter armored forces of this type on the battlefield and survive.

The Army has encountered repeated difficulty in selecting both a light and medium anti-tank weapon which would defeat the potential threat at a cost sufficiently affordable to obtain the quantity of weapons necessary.

In the congressionally directed lightweight anti-armor weapons test, none of the weapons tested demonstrated a cabability to penetrate the frontal armor of modern tanks. The planned replacement for the Dragon, the Rattler, was canceled based on affordability and other reasons.

As a consequence of these circumstances, the committee recommends several initiatives.

First, a small increase in funding above the request for the Light Anti-Tank Weapon, AT-4 will almost double the quantity to be procured. While this weapon does not have the ability to defeat frontal armor, it is substantially more capable than the current LAW. The committee recognizes that development of a light weight affordable weapon capable of defeating frontal armor may not be feasible. However, the AT-4 may have potential for product improvement to accomplish the frontal armor penetration requirement at a future date. In any case, the capabilities of the AT-4 make it a desirable multi-purpose weapon.

Second, for a relatively small increase in funding, a product improvement of the Dragon warhead provides a substantially increased penetration capability. As the Dragon will continue to play an important infantry anti-tank role for at least the next decade, a product improvement of this type will substantially improve the capability of the medium anti-tank weapon and enhance the survivability of the infantryman on the battlefield.

Support for a product improvment of the Dragon should not be construed as lack of support for development of the Advanced Antiarmor Weapons Systems (AAWS). Development of a lighter, more lethal, and accurate weapon should continue to receive high priority funding.

Third, the committee supports the February fiscal year 1985 request for procurement of the TOW. This proven cost effective weapon is the only fielded system which gives the infantryman the desired capability. Product improvements have increased its lethality and effectiveness in adverse weather and against countermeasures. The TOW weapons system will be the long range antiarmor missile for infantry, cavalry and marine units into the foreseeable future.

COPPERHEAD

The request of the Department of Defense included $102.8 million for procurement of 2,253, 155mm HE projectiles, (Copperhead).

Recent tests of the Copperhead indicate that its reliability has substantially improved. While testing is incomplete and this committee will continue to monitor subsequent tests, it now appears that the principal issue concerning this projectile is one of the cost effectiveness.

The committee recommends $135.1 million to procure 3,353 Copperhead projectiles, an increase of $32.3 million and 1,000 projectiles above the request.

However, in an effort to insure that the unit cost of this system is reduced, the committee directs that the additional amount of $32.3 million not be obligated until the Secretary of the Army certifies that the unit price of the additional projectiles will not exceed $30,000.

RDX/HMX

The entire production capability of the United States for RDX/HMX used by all of the services and the Department of Energy is at a single location Holston, AAP, Kingsport, Tenn. This facility contains about 90 percent of the free world's RDX/HMX manufacturing capacity. This high risk situation leaves the United States and much of the free world vulnerable to production disruptions due to catastrophic accident or sabotage.

The disposition of the plant further increases its vulnerability. The basic manufacturing area and the chemical processing facility are connected by a five-mile long pipe line that feeds the critical chemicals to the manufacturing area and returns spent chemicals for reprocessing. The pipe line is unprotected. It runs through parts of the city of Kingsport, Tenn., along public railroad tracks, and crosses the Holston River twice. Dispersion of future manufacturing facilities is urgently needed to increase the survivability of this critical component of the industrial base.

In addition, while the demand increases for RDX/HMX, the manufacturing capacity of the plant is far below the requirement.

The committee has received the report of the Defense Department on this issue, dated May 21, 1984, and endorses the thrust of the report except that the committee feels that the department is being too conservative in its plans to facilitate alternate sources of this vital commodity. Therefore, the committee has recommended an increase in the funding for this account by $55 million and directs that these funds be applied to accelerate the completion of the HMX pilot plant and the first HMX production line at Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant and the first RDX production line at the Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant in accordance with the Army's previous public announcement.

THE AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE

The committee remains concerned about the capability of the production base to perform its mission during mobilization in a timely and effective manner. While the active equipment is largely capable of performing its mission, the accumulated unfunded maintenance backlog in the Government-owned production base is approximately $1.7 billion. There are over 1,600 known voids in Government-furnished Plant Equipment Packages. Seven percent of the industrial plant equipment is judged to be in poor condition. While the deficiencies are largely in the inactive portion of the production base, they would substantially affect its ability to respond to a national emergency.

Reactivation time for the inactive lines now require as much as 22 months to reach design maximum rates. Funding in the form of Production Support and Equipment Replacement (PS&ER) projects is required for the active production lines at an average of $79 million per year for the out years. That is 200 percent over the current funding level.

In addition to the maintenance and replacement of existing equipment, funding for equipment in support of new items is required. If the current sizing guidance for new facilities for new items continues in force, an additional $1.5 billion will be required to support anticipated FYDP acquisition through the end of the century.

In order to obtain perspective on the magnitude of the deficient status of the production base the total modernization/expansion program since 1970 has amounted to $2.978 billion. The replacement value of the Government-owned base is estimated at $22.382 billion. This funding profile would provide the replacement of the base in approximately 100 years.

In order to meet the total out year mobilization requirements, an additional investment of approximately $31.8 billion is required over and above the $2.3 billion required for peacetime requirements.

Based on these deficiencies, the Army is encouraged to expedite development of its ammunition workloading simulation model which is designed to improve the efficiency of workloading and improve the condition of the active and inactive ammunition production base. Completion of this model should facilitate an analysis of the most critical funding shortfalls within the base and provide information to most effectively begin a program to address the shortfalls.

To support the effort of improving the ammunition production base, and particularly the facilitation of new production facilities, the committee recommends that the Army be authorized an additional $5.0 million for a second source facility for combustible cartridge cases for tank and artillery munitions to be selected by competitive bid.

BINARY CHEMICAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The administration requested a total of $1,126 million for the binary chemical modernization program in fiscal year 1985. Of that total, $813 million or 73 percent is for protective measures, $163 million or 14 percent is for retaliatory programs, and $150 million or 13 percent is for demilitarization purposes. The funding profile is as follows:

CHEMICAL DETERRENT PROGRAM

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year—			
	1984 request	1984 enacted	1985 request	1985 recommend
Protective measures:				
RDT&E	$334.9	$334.9	$382.0	$382.0
O&M	146.7	146.7	167.0	167.0
Procurement	97.7	97.7	141.0	141.0
War reserve stocks	85.0	85.0	90.0	90.0
(Milcon) [1]	(30.9)	(30.9)	(33.0)	(33.0)
Total	664.3	664.3	780.0	780.0

CHEMICAL DETERRENT PROGRAM—Continued

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year—			
	1984 request	1984 enacted	1985 request	1985 recommend
Retaliatory capability:				
RDT&E	33.4	33.4	31.0	31.0
O&M	7.4	7.4	6.0	6.0
Procurement of production capability	112.5	0	42.0	0
Procurement of munitions	18.1	0	[2] 53.0	0
(Milcon) [1]	(–)	(–)	(31.0)	(31.0)
Total	171.4	40.8	132.0	37.0
Demilitarization:				
RDT&E	11.3	11.3	8.0	8.0
O&M	54.5	54.5	96.0	96.0
(Milcon) [1]	(10.2)	(0)	(46.0)	(46.0)
Total	65.8	65.8	104.0	104.0

[1] Authorized under separate title.
[2] Long-lead component parts.

The administration's request contains no funding for the actual production of chemical munitions. Instead, funding is provided for preparation of the production facility base, and limited production of certain long-lead component parts essential to support a possible future production go-ahead decision. Production of all the components necessary for final production and their assembly into munitions cannot occur without future congressional approval and funding.

The committee remains very concerned about the expanding Soviet capability to wage chemical war, and their continued willingness to do so in violation of solemn international accords. The 15 year unilateral moratorium on the production of chemical weapons undertaken by the United States has elicited no similar Soviet restraint. In addition, the use of mustard and nerve gas by Iraq in its war with Iran highlights the need to be able to deter chemical attacks in a wide range of theaters.

The committee is convinced that the current U.S. chemical posture does not pose a credible deterrent to the use of chemical weapons against U.S. and Allied forces. Although large in size, only 10 percent of our current stockpile is in the form of useful munitions. And, as was the finding of last year's Blue Ribbon Panel on Chemical Stockpile Status, there exist uncertainties about the future status of that portion of our stockpile that today is considered usable. The committee reaffirms its support for the modernization of our chemical stockpile with more effective and safer to handle binary munitions, and it supports ongoing efforts to demilitarize the existing unusable portion of our stockpile.

The administration's request for fiscal year 1985 is consistent with and supportive of their ultimate goal, which is the negotiation of a comprehensive, verifiable ban on chemical weapons. Toward this end, Vice President Bush has tabled a U.S. draft treaty before the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. The Senate Armed

Services Committee fully supports this initiative, and is hopeful that the Soviets respond favorably to the U.S. proposal.

The committee remains convinced that there exists a strong correlation between demonstrations of U.S. determination to redress the dangerous asymetries that currently exist in U.S./Soviet chemical warfare capabilities, and the likelihood that the Soviets will respond seriously to our arms control proposals. As it is currently structured, the U.S. chemical modernization program supports our negotiating efforts. No actual weapons would be produced before there has been ample opportunity to test Soviet intentions at the negotiating table.

While the committee has strongly supported the binary chemical modernization program in previous years, the Congress has yet to provide the necessary funding. In recognition that it is unlikely that the Congress will take a more favorable position on this program in an election year, the committee very reluctantly recommends a reduction of the $95 million requested for the production of chemical weapon components and the related production facilities. The committee does recommend that all other funding for the chemical deterrent program, including defensive measures and the demilitarization of obsolete munitions, be fully funded as requested.

The committee commends the President for his courageous position in support of this politically unpopular program, and for his determined efforts to achieve a comprehensive agreement with the Soviet Union banning chemical weapons. The committee encourages the President to resubmit this request in the fiscal year 1986 defense budget request. It is the committee's view that the decision to initiate production of modern binary chemical weapons should be reconsidered at that time, based in part on the Soviet response—or lack thereof—to U.S. chemical disarmament proposals.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Tactical and support vehicles		$1,535.5		−$12.8		$1,522.7
Fast attack vehicle	402	(12.8)	−402	(−12.8)	0	(0)
Communications and electronics equipment		2,927.0		−409.1		2,517.9
IHF radio mods		(5.4)		(−5.4)		(0)
Joint crisis management capability		(7.2)		(−7.2)		(0)
C–E facilities/projects		(19.7)		(−8.0)		(11.7)
DSCS, opn control system		(50.6)		(−16.3)		(34.3)
EUCOM C^3 (NWS)		(81.3)		(−33.3)		(48.0)
Base communications (EUCOM)		(24.5)		(−5.0)		(19.5)
Trailblazer		(105.5)		(−105.5)		(0)
Tech Recon and Surv Sys (TECRAS)		(7.1)		(−1.6)		(5.5)
Battery computer system		(39.7)		(−7.0)		(32.7)
Worldwide C^3 ADPE		(15.1)		(−.9)		(14.2)
Mod of in-service equipment (EW)		(13.1)		(−6.5)		(6.6)
Night sight AN/TAS–4		(38.8)		(−38.8)		(0)
Aquila		(144.5)		(−111.7)		(32.8)
Spares (telecom)		(201.4)		(−6.3)		(195.1)
Spares (other)		(191.9)		(−5.6)		(186.3)
Undistributed reduction		(.........)		(−50.0)		(−50.0)
Other support equipment		1,559.9		−123.9		1,436.0
Bridge, ribbon, transporter		(28.0)		(−14.0)		(14.0)
Items less than $900,000 (CSS–EQ)		(14.8)		(−2.9)		(11.9)
Deployable medical system		(88.4)		(−44.0)		(44.4)
Combat spt equip, medical		(70.9)		(−30.0)		(40.9)
Shop equip, trk mtd		(39.9)		(−13.0)		(26.9)
Boat, service, CHI		(5.0)		(−5.0)		(0)
Undistributed reduction		(.........)		(−15.0)		(−15.0)
Total, other procurement, Army		6,022.4		−545.8		5,476.6

SERVICE BOAT

The administration initially requested $5.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of two service boats. In the revised budget, the administration deleted this request. No specific justification for this revision was presented.

The mission of the service boat is to provide (1) passenger and cargo transport along coastlines, in harbors, and on inland waterways; (2) waterborne command and control; and (3) security patrol.

The committee recommends no authorization in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of service boats.

WARTIME HOST NATION SUPPORT

The administration requested $17.7 million in Other Procurement for the Army and $7.9 million in Other Procurement for the Air Force for the Wartime Host Nation Support (WHNS) program in fiscal year 1985. In addition to these amounts, the Operations and Maintenance account includes requests of $10.06 million for the Army and $6.84 million for the Air Force for the WHNS program.

On April 15, 1982, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) signed a WHNS agreement that creates new Reserve units in the FRG Armed Forces—totaling approximately 93,000 personnel—which, upon mobilization, would be solely dedicated to the wartime logistics support of U.S. combat forces in Europe. The United States and the FRG will share the total costs of the program equally. The funds requested by the administration for the WHNS program will meet the U.S. share of the total costs in fiscal year 1985.

The program is a major breakthrough because, for the first time, a NATO ally has agreed to pay a portion of the support costs of U.S. combat units. Traditionally, support has been considered a national responsibility with each country expected to shoulder its own logistics burden. Moreover, the U.S.-FRG WHNS program is extremely cost-effective. The support by 93,000 German Reservists will cost the United States only about one-tenth of what it would cost to provide the same capability with U.S. Reserves.

The committee recommends authorization in fiscal year 1985 in the Other Procurement account of $17.7 million for the Army and $7.9 million for the Air Force for the Wartime Host Nation Support program.

LOGISTICS SUPPORT VESSEL

The administration requested $18.8 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of one Logistics Support Vessel (LSV) for the Army. The Army plans to acquire four LSV's through a competitive, 4-year, multiyear procurement initiated with the $28.5 million appropriated in fiscal year 1984.

The LSV, with a 12-knot speed and 2,000-ton capacity, will be used for volume line haul of dry and liquid cargo to remote undeveloped areas along coastlines and inland waterways. In addition, the LSV will be used in logistics-over-the-shore operations.

The Army has indicated that in the absence of any known restrictions and consistent with current policy of the Department of Defense, this procurement will be open to all foreign and domestic offerors. However, restrictions of the Buy American Act will apply to foreign offers except where waived by existing Memoranda of Understanding and Memoranda of Agreement.

The committee does not believe that procurement of LSV's from foreign sources is consistent with the intent of Section 7309 of Title 10, United States Code, enacted by the Congress during consideration of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1983. In an effort to preserve adequate U.S. shipbuilding capacity, this section bars the Navy from buying ships from foreign shipyards unless the President determines that it is in the interest of national security to do so. The committee believes that the Congress intended that all military vessels, not just "naval vessels", be covered by this restriction. To clarify this issue, the committee recommends bill language that expands the scope of Section 7309 of Title 10 to cover all military vessels.

The committee also recommends authorization of $18.8 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of one Logistics Support Vessel for the Army.

LIGHTER, AIR CUSHION VEHICLE (LACV)

The administration did not request authorization in fiscal year 1985 for lighter, air cushion vehicles (LACV) for the Army.

These vehicles, which travel at speeds up to 40 knots, operate over water, land, snow, ice, swamps and low brush, through 8-foot surf and over 4-foot obstacles, and are ideal for over-the-shore operations. Of the 24 vehicles already procured by the Army, 12 have been delivered and are now operational. The vehicle has been very highly acclaimed by the Army.

With the potential requirement for U.S. forces to establish a forced entry in many places of the world where no port facilities exist, the absence of sufficient quantities of this type of craft is troubling. The committee is concerned about the ability of the Army to transport logistic supplies in over-the-shore operations.

As a consequence, the committee directs the Army to review its requirements for this type of vehicle and, consistent with the results of the review, initiate a reprogramming request to procure additional vehicles.

FAST ATTACK VEHICLE (FAV)

The administration requested $12.8 million to procure 402 fast attack vehicles. The fast attack vehicle is a lightweight, low silhouette vehicle armed with a TOW missile or a MK-19 40mm grenade machine gun. Previously, the FAV was to be used exclusively by the Army's 9th High Technology Division. With the announcement of plans to establish several new light divisions, the committee has been advised that the FAV may become part of the new divisions' equipment inventories.

There is pending before the committee a reprograming request to obligate $5.4 million of fiscal year 1984 funds to procure additional FAVs for testing. Until the requirements and plans for the FAV are firmly established, the committee believes that the program should proceed at a modest pace. Therefore, the committee approves the reprograming request but defers the fiscal year 1985 request. Further, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Army should submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a detailed report on Army-wide requirements and planned roles and missions for the fast attack vehicle. The report should also address these issues in the context of the announced plans to establish the new light divisions.

MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIPMENT

The committee understands the Army's urgent requirement for this mobile communications system and generally supports the Army thrust of acquiring this program on a non-developmental basis, but has some concerns.

Comments from the Army indicated that a review conducted by the Army concluded that possibly two or more foreign systems were available that could partially satisfy the basic requirement for mobile subscriber equipment (MSE). The committee is concerned that foreign systems may not interoperate or be compatible with the present U.S. tactical communications system.

Therefore, the committee recommends that if a joint U.S.-foreign system is selected to meet the MSE requirement, that such system from the start (initial buy) be compatible and interoperate with the present U.S. tactical communications system. The committee further recommends that as the Army procures additional systems, every attempt be made to increase U.S. production content through proper licensing or co-production agreements.

REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLE (AQUILA)

The administration requested $144.5 million for the procurement of the Army's remotely piloted vehicle, the Aquila. The Aquila is designed as an unmanned reconnaissance craft capable of providing precise targeting information to artillery units day or night.

Technical problems in the Aquila's software, engine, communications and navigation systems have delayed the developmental testing schedule.

The committee supports the effort to provide our ground forces with standoff targeting information, but in view of the current technical difficulties facing the Aquila program, believes that initial production should be deferred one year. The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $32.8 million for the initial procurement of the Aquila Remotely Piloted Vehicle system. This represents a reduction of $100.0 million from the administration's request for air vehicles, and $11.7 million from the request for initial spares.

UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH

The Army has again requested $15,500 for initial procurement of the United Level Circuit Switches (ULCS). This duplicates the fiscal year 1984 request which was deferred when the ULCS test program had not achieved its objectives.

The committee is concerned that the program continues to experience difficulty in successfully completing the required developmental and operational testing and that these ULCS switches may not be ready for procurement in fiscal year 1985 or by any certain date. The committee is aware of the Army's immediate requirement for unit level switches and that because of delays in the current ULCS program the Army is considering other alternatives to satisfy this need. The committee supports the Army requirement and has included the amount requested, to be available for procurement of either the ULCS or an alternative system. The decision concerning which system to procure should be based on a comparison of the performance and life cycle cost of a system which merits the Army's requirement for a unit level switch.

PORT OF SAVANNAH

The port of Savannah, Georgia is a key point of sealift embarkation for military forces stationed in the southeastern United States, particularly the 24th Infantry Division at Fort Stewart. The port's utility is currently restricted by the clearance under the Talmadge Bridge located near the entrance to the port. A recent collision with the bridge of the superstructure of a cargo vessel chartered by the Department of Defense illustrates the hazards and limitations of the bridge.

The committee directs the Army to conduct an analysis of the impact of the Talmadge Bridge on military transportation requirements both in peacetime and wartime. This study should consider both current and programed forces in the region, to include the proposed beddown of elements of the light infantry division at Fort Benning, as well as the projected inventory of military and commercial cargo vessels over the next 25 years. In addition to the above considerations, the study should also examine the use of alternative, less restricted ports, and determine the additional costs in time and money that the use of alternative ports would entail. This report should be provided to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than November 1, 1984.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

[Dollars in million]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Combat aircraft:						
A-6E (Attack) Intruder (MYP)	6	($225.6)		(−$15.0)	6	($210.6)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−11.0)		(---.-)		(−11.0)
Net		214.6		−15.0		199.6
EA-6B (electronic warfare) Prowler	6	(384.6)			6	(384.6)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−23.6)				(−23.6)
Net		361.0				361.0
EA-6B (electronic warfare) advance procurement (CY)		18.6				18.6
AV-8B (V/STOL)	32	(840.6)			32	(840.6)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−98.4)				(−98.4)
Net		742.2				742.2
AV-8B (V/STOL) advance procurement (CY)		80.4		−21.0		59.4
F-14A (fighter) Tomcat	24	(965.7)		(−4.0)	24	(961.7)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−178.8)		(--.-)		(−178.8)
Net		786.9		−4.0		782.9
F-14A (Fighter) Tomcat advance procurement (CY)		190.0		−19.2		170.8
F/A-18 (strike fighter) Hornet	84	(2,566.5)			84	(2,566.5)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−218.4)				(−218.4)
Net		2,348.1				2,348.1
F/A-18 (Strike Fighter) Hornet advance procurement (CY)		337.9		60.0		277.9
CH/MH-53 (Helicopter) Super Stallion (MYP)	10	(229.9)		(−10.0)	10	(219.9)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−6.6)		(--.-)		(−6.6)
Net		223.3		−10.0		213.3
CH/MH-53 (Helicopter) Super Stallion (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		69.6		−33.5		36.1
AH-1T (Helicopter) Sea Cobra	22	(195.8)			22	(195.8)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−17.8)				(−17.8)
Net		178.0				178.0
AH-1T (Helicopter) Sea Cobra advance procurement (CY)		15.0				15.0
SH-60B (ASW Helo) Seahawk	18	(392.0)	+6	(+67.4)	24	(459.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−58.8)		(--.-)		(−58.8)
Net		333.2		+67.4		400.6
SH-60B (ASW Helo) Seahawk advance procurement (CY)		52.4		+5.5		57.9

[Dollars in million]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
P-3C (Patrol) Orion	9	(463.3)		(−57.3)	9	(406.0)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−84.4)		(—.–)		(−84.4)
Net		378.9		−57.3		321.6
P-3C (Patrol) Orion advance procurement (CY)		86.1		−36.1		50.0
E-2C (Early Warning) Hawkeye	6	(337.8)		(−6.0)	6	(331.8)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−25.6)		(—.–)		(−25.6)
Net		312.2		−6.0		306.2
E-2C (Early Warning) Hawkeye advance procurement (CY)		29.6				29.6
SH-2F (ASW Helo) Seasprite	6	(70.4)			6	(70.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−4.5)				(−4.5)
Net		65.9				65.9
Total, combat aircraft		(6,823.9)		(−189.2)		(6,634.7)
Airlift aircraft:						
C-9 Skytrain II		33.9				33.9
UC-12B	12	32.0	−12	−32.0	0	0
C-2 (MYP)	8	(184.3)			8	(184.3)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−40.1)				(−40.1)
Net		144.2				144.2
C-2 (MYP) Advance procurement (CY)		41.2				41.2
Total, airlift aircraft		(251.3)		(−32.0)		(219.3)
Trainer aircraft:						
Adversary	8	66.8	+2	+50.0	10	116.8
TH-57	36	24.4			36	24.4
Total, trainer aircraft		(91.2)		(+50.0)		(141.2)
Modification of aircraft:						
A-3 series		5.7				5.7
A-4 series		21.9				21.9
A-6 series (MYP)		149.4				149.4
EA-6 series		79.6				79.6
A-7 series		75.0				75.0
AV-8 series		15.4				15.4
F-4 series		5.0				5.0
RF-4 series		6.2				6.2
F-14A series		203.3				203.3
F-8 series		.2				.2
F-5 series		3.6				3.6
OV-10A		47.0				47.0
F-18 mods		40.2				40.2
H-46 series		157.5				157.5
H-53 series		44.4				44.4
Penguin		0		+11.7		11.7
H-1 series		96.7				96.7
H-2 series		15.8				15.8
H-3 series		110.7				110.7
P-3 series		165.4				165.4
S-3		163.6				163.6
US-3A COD		2.4				2.4
E-2 series		74.7				74.7
Trainer A/C series		7.9				7.9
TH-57		.7				.7
EC-130 series		34.0				34.0
C-130 series		19.9				19.9
FEWSG		34.5				34.5
Cargo/transport A/C series		4.4				4.4

[Dollars in million]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Various		24.2				24.2
Power plant changes		13.1				13.1
Misc Flt Safety/Oper Necessity Changes		7.0				7.0
Common ECM Equipment		264.8				264.8
Common Avionics Equipment		25.2				25.2
Undistributed reduction				−200.0		−200.0
Total, modification of aircraft		(1,919.5)		(−188.3)		(1,731.2)
Aircraft spares and repair parts:		1,609.7		−30.0		1,579.7
Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities:						
Common Ground Equipment		645.2				645.2
Aircraft Industrial Facilities		55.8				55.8
War Consumables		28.7				28.7
Other Production Charges		49.0				49.0
Undistributed reduction				−100.0		−100.0
Total, Support Equipment and Facilities		(778.7)		(−100.0)		(678.7)
Undistributed reduction				−40.0		−40.0
Total, aircraft procurement, Navy		11,474.2		−529.5		10,944.7

A-6E (INTRUDER)

The administration requested $214.6 million for the procurement of 6 A-6E Intruder aircraft in fiscal year 1985. The A-6E is an all-weather, carrier based, medium attack aircraft currently operated by both the Navy and the Marine Corps.

On January 1, 1982 the Navy calculated that in fiscal year 1984 there would exist a surplus of 19 A-6E's in the inventory. On January 1, 1983, the Navy estimated a fiscal year 1984 surplus of 22 A-6E's. On the basis of these projections the committee recommended suspending the A-6E production line and transferring Marine A-6E's to the Navy to meet future attrition requirements.

The Navy has since restructured 4 of its 13 airwings and added requirements for 2 Reserve A-6E squadrons thereby creating a shortage of 26 A-6E's in fiscal year 1984.

The committee is not persuaded by this juggling of requirements that a significant shortfall exists in the inventory of A-6E's. However, the Navy's experimentation with various airwing configurations to obtain the optimum mix of capabilities is entirely appropriate, and the committee does not wish to prejudge the outcome of those experiments.

The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $199.6 million for the procurement of 6 A-6E's in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $15.0 million from the administration's request.

EA-6B (PROWLER) ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $361.0 million for the procurement of 6 EA-6B aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $18.6 million in advance procurement for 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The EA-6B is a carrier-based, electronic jamming aircraft designed to protect strike aircraft through electronic countermeasures.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the EA-6B Prowler.

AV-8B HARRIER V/TOL ATTACK AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $742.2 million for the procurement of 32 AV-8B aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $80.4 million in advance procurement for 46 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The AV-8B Harrier is a vertical take-off-and-land (VTOL) attack aircraft which will replace the AV-8A in the Marine Corps inventory.

The committee recommends authorization of $742.2 million for the procurement of 32 AV-8B Harriers in fiscal year 1985 and $59.4 million in advance procurement for 36 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The deletion of 10 aircraft and $21.0 million in advance procurement is strictly the result of congressionally mandated budget reductions and is made without prejudice.

F-14 (TOMCAT) FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $786.9 million for the procurement of 24 F-14 aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $190.0 million in advance procurement for 24 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The F-14 Tomcat is a two-place, variable geometry, fleet defense fighter. Equipped with Phoenix, Sparrow, Sidewinder missiles, and a 20 mm cannon, the F-14 is the Navy's primary fleet air defense aircraft.

The committee recommends an authorization of $782.9 million for the procurement of 24 F-14 aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $170.8 million in advance procurement for 24 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. This represents a total reduction of $23.2 million from the administration's request.

F/A-18 (HORNET) FIGHTER/ATTACK AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $2,348.1 million for the procurement of 84 F/A-18 aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $337.9 million in advance procurement funds for 102 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The F/A-18 Hornet is a high performance, carrier-based aircraft designed to perform both fighter and attack missions.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,348.1 million for the procurement of 84 F/A-18's in fiscal year 1985 and $277.9 million in advance procurement for 84 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The recommendation to reduce advance procurement by 18 aircraft and $60.0 million is made without prejudice and is strictly the result of congressional budgetary pressure.

CH/MH-53E SEA STALLION

The administration requested $223.3 million for the procurement of 10 CH/MH-53E helicopters in fiscal year 1985 and $69.6 million in advance procurement for 14 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The CH-53 is a shipboard compatible, heavy transport helicopter configured for both Navy and Marine heavy lift missions. The MH-

53E is a three-engine, ship compatible, heavy lift transport helicopter with a significantly improved Airborne Mine-Countermeasures capability.

The committee recommends authorization of $213.3 million for the procurement of 8 CH-53E helicopters and 2 MH-53Es in fiscal year 1985, and $36.1 million in advance procurement for 14 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The committee also recommends approval of the administration's request to initiate a multi-year contract for the CH/MH-53E.

The committee recommends the following reductions to the administration's request:

Aircraft procurement

$10.0 million: anticipated contract savings;

Advance procurement

$33.5 million: savings associated with shifting multi-year funding policy from full funding of termination liability to expenditure basis funding.

SH-60B LAMPS MK-III ASW HELICOPTER (SEAHAWK)

The administration requested $333.2 million for the procurement of 18 SH-60B ASW helicopters in fiscal year 1985 and $52.4 million for advance procurement.

The SH-60B ASW helicopter is the air subsystem of the Light Airborne Multi-Purpose System (LAMPS) MK-III weapon system. The LAMPS MK-III is a computer-integrated, ship/helicopter system optimized for anti-submarine warfare (ASW), but it includes secondary missions of anti-ship surveillance and targeting, search and rescue, vertical replenishment, and spotting naval gunfire. The SH-60B helicopter carries sonobuoys, MK-46 torpedoes and electronic equipment for the processing and transmission of acoustic and electronic warfare data.

Last year, during the House/Senate Conference on the authorization bill, the Conferees strongly endorsed the plan of the Department of the Navy to procure the LAMPS MK-III helicopters at a rate of 24 helicopters per year and stated that "the Conferees concur in the rationale that supports a production rate of 24 helicopters per year and expect that the Department of Defense will sustain at least this rate throughout the remaining years of the program."

The SH-60B LAMPS MK-III represents a quantum improvement in ship-launched airborne ASW capability. In operational and developmental evaluation, it has proven to be an extremely reliable and effective weapons system capable of successfully prosecuting submarine contacts out to the third convergence zone. Moreover, because of cost conscious management of the program, aircraft unit costs were kept relatively constant even in the face of dramatic congressionally-mandated stretch-outs in the fiscal year 1983 budget. In this budget, marginal costs are such that the six additional SH-60B LAMPS MK-III helicopters can be procured at a very favorable price.

The committee recommends authorization of $400.6 million for the procurement of 24 SH-60B helicopters in fiscal year 1985 and $57.9 million for advance procurement. This increase of $67.4 million provides for six additional helicopters in fiscal year 1985 and adds $5.5 million for advance procurement for 24 helicopters in fiscal year 1986.

LONG RANGE MASTER PLAN FOR NAVAL AIR ASW FORCES

The administration requested funds in fiscal year 1985 for continued procurement of P-3Cs, SH-60Bs, and SH-2Fs. Funds were also requested for research and development for the S-3B Weapon System Improvement program and the CV ASW Helicopter, as well as procurement and RDT&E for various other Air ASW programs including processors, torpedoes, sonobouys and other support equipment.

The committee approved most of the authorization, but made reductions in funding levels for the P-3C, while retaining the requested nine aircraft. The committee increased the procurement for the SH-60B and funded the SH-2F procurement for the Naval Reserve.

With regard to P-3C aircraft, the committee understands that the number of P-3Cs required to be procured annually to maintain the Navy's long range maritime patrol force structure at its present mix of 24 active and 13 reserve squadrons is much higher than requested. Moreover, the committee notes that without a significant increase in P-3C procurement in the future, the maritime patrol force structure will suffer a severe decline in the 1992-1995 time frame as about 200 older model P-3A/B aircraft in the active and reserve squadrons reach the end of their 28-year service life.

The committee is concerned, however, about the Navy's intentions for maintaining and modernizing its active and reserve maritime patrol squadrons. There has been conflicting testimony before Congress about the number of P-3Cs needed to be procured annually, and there have been conflicting studies about maritime patrol force structure requirements. Internal budget deliberations on P-3C procurement have resulted in almost constantly changing annual procurement projections.

With regard to the SH-60B LAMPS MK-III, the committee is also concerned that the annual procurement, as requested, was below that which is economically sensible, and that the total program requested by the Department may be insufficient to procure the number of helicopters needed to fulfill the surface combatant based air ASW mission.

Much the same is true for the SH-2F LAMPS MK-I. Questions remain as to how many SH-2F should be procured, and what the mix should be between active and reserve squadrons. Moreover, the direction the program seems to be taking is far from consistent.

The Navy's maritime patrol community is also a prime example of the success of the Total Force policy. In Air ASW, it stands as a clear success story to be emulated by the rest of the Navy. Naval Reservists are well integrated into the operations of the active squadrons and make a major contribution to our Navy's abilities to accomplish the long range ASW patrol mission. Naval Reservists flying older P-3A/B aircraft perform their missions well, considering the limitations of the aircraft which they fly, and the committee has supported limited modernization of these platforms to maintain their effectiveness. Last year, for example, the committee authorized the procurement of additional Tactical Navigation Modification (TACNAVMOD) kits for this purpose. The committee believes that this success should be extended to all air ASW forces, as well.

Consequently, the Secretary of the Navy is requested to furnish the committee, in conjuction with submission of the fiscal year 1986 defense budget request, a comprehensive master plan for modernization and maintenance of the Navy's Air ASW forces, both in the active and reserve components. Such a master plan should include a procurement plan for aircraft needed to satisfy the requirements of both the active and reserve forces, along with a schedule for any service life extension program (SLEP) where appropriate and a modernization plan for those aircraft not being replaced through new procurement. Any planned or contemplated changes in the active and reserve maritime patrol squadron force structure should be addressed, along with Navy intentions regarding development of successor aircraft, where applicable. This plan should be comprehensive in that it should also address procurement levels of major supporting weapons and expendable sensors to include torpedoes and sonobuoys.

EP-3 ELECTRONIC WARFARE AIRCRAFT

The administration made no request for procurement of EP-3 aircraft in fiscal year 1985. The EP-3 is a reconnaissance aircraft which will provide tactical electronic warfare and communications in support of the battlegroup commander. The EP-3 is a basic P-3 aircraft equipped with sophisticated electronic and communications equipment.

The committee views with grave concern the critical need to modernize the current fleet of EP-3 aircraft. Last year the Department of the Navy was directed to modify a P-3 aircraft that is currently in the initial stages of production to the EP-3 configuration which would serve as the start of a program to modernize this fleet of special purpose aircraft. Since that time the Navy has taken no action and has recently terminated the urgently needed sensor update program. The tactical information that is provided by these aircraft to our forces is critical to battle group survival.

The committee directs that the Department of the Navy provide a comprehensive plan and funding profile for the required sensor update program and a plan and funding profile for the replacement of the present fleet of EP-3 aircraft with current production P-3C aircraft by March 1, 1985.

E-2C HAWKEYE

The administration requested $312.2 million for the procurement of 6 E-2C aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $29.6 million in advance procurement for 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The committee recommends an authorization of $306.2 million for the procurement of 6 E-2C aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $29.6

million in advance procurement for 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. This is a reduction of $6.0 million from the administration's request.

SH-2F LAMPS MK-I ASW HELICOPTER (SEASPRITE)

The administration requested $65.9 million for the procurement of six SH-2F ASW helicopters in fiscal year 1985.

The SH-2F, a two-place twin-engine helicopter with a single main lift rotor and anti-torque tail rotor, is the air subsystem of the LAMPS MK-I weapon system. As such, it deploys aboard FF-1040, FF-1052, and FFG-7 class frigates in the primary role of anti-submarine warfare and anti-ship surveillance and targeting. It has limited onboard capability to redetect, classify, and attack enemy submarines with two MK-46 torpedoes. For most missions of any duration it carries only one torpedo. It has secondary missions of search and rescue, medical evacuation and communication relay.

The committee endorses the concept of maintaining a limited SH-2F production line, but is concerned about reliability and performance factors in the existing helicopter/engine configuration. Moreover, the committee is concerned about a lack of ASW capability aboard many of the reserve surface ships. Consequently, the committee is recommending that the procurement of six SH-2F helicopters be designated for use by the Naval Reserves. Also, the committee recommends additional funds in the Navy RDT&E account to continue testing and adaptation of the T-700 engine for the SH-2F.

The committee received testimony from the Reserves and reviewed an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office which indicates that the Naval Reserves with the LAMPS MK-I helicopter could make a significant contribution to the Navy's wartime ASW capability. This concept would provide additional LAMPS MK-I helicopters, upgraded with the T-700 engine, to the Naval Reserves. Upon mobilization in a crisis, they could provide a second LAMPS MK-I helicopter to those ships having two helicopter deck spots, but only one active LAMPS MK-I assigned.

The committee believes that this is a very cost effective method of enhancing the U.S. Navy's ASW capability and is an excellent mission for the Naval Reserve. The committee, therefore, recommends that up to six SH-2F LAMPS MK-I helicopters authorized for fiscal year 1985 be assigned directly to the reserves. In addition, in order to allow the Navy to pursue this program in fiscal year 1986, the committee recommends that up to $8 million of the $65.9 million authorized for procurement of the SH-2F in fiscal year 1985 be used for advanced procurement of up to 12 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

Finally, to insure that fiscal year 1986 and subsequent buys of the LAMPS MK-I helicopter can be equipped with the more effective T-700 engine, the committee recommends an addition of $17 million in the Navy RDT&E account to complete certification of the T-700 engine in the SH-2F helicopter.

C-9B AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $33.9 million in fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of used C-9B transport aircraft and $6.1 million in initial spares. The quantity of used aircraft to be procured will be determined by market conditions; the expected range is between two and six used C-9Bs.

The C-9B is a twin fan-jet, commercial, transport aircraft configured to carry either cargo, personnel, or a mixture. These aircraft will be utilized for priority transport of cargo and personnel to meet Navy intratheater airlift requirements.

The committee recommends authorization in fiscal year 1985 of $33.9 million for procurement of used C-9B aircraft and $6.1 million in initial spares.

C-2 GREYHOUND

The administration requested $144.2 million for the procurement of 8 C-2 aircraft in 1985 and $41.2 million in advance procurement for 8 aircraft in 1986. The C-2 is a twin engine, turbo-prop aircraft designed to perform the rapid response, Carrier Onboard Delivery (COD) mission. It is currently being purchased on a multi-year contract.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the C-2 Greyhound.

AGGRESSOR ADVERSARY AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $66.8 million for the procurement of 8 Adversary aircraft for the Navy.

The committee carefully considered the issue of Aggressor/Adversary aircraft for both the Air Force and Navy. Clearly, the experience of both services in aerial combat during the early years of the Vietnam War revealed serious deficiencies in the aerial combat training of U.S. military pilots. The consequent loss of U.S. pilots against the Soviet-built MIG's was on the order of 1:1.

These early losses led to a complete reassessment of aerial combat training, and both services adopted a completely new approach. It was recognized first that air-to-air missiles did not make aerial combat training obsolete, and intensive realistic training in aerial combat was a mandatory requirement. (Recent aerial combat in the Middle-East has reinforced this conclusion). Second, it was recognized that to be most effective, aerial combat training should take place against dissimilar aircraft, one with visual and performance characteristics that simulated the enemy threat, and these aircraft should be flown by pilots highly skilled in aerial combat maneuvering and anticipated enemy tactics. During the later stages of the Vietnam war, after both services had adopted this concept using special Adversary (Navy) and Aggressor (Air Force) training units, the kill ratios against enemy MIG's improved to as high as 12:1. The requirement for dissimilar training with these special Adversary/Aggressor units was vindicated and both the Air Force and Navy have continued this approach during the 1970's and 1980's with strong support from this committee.

The Navy's current inventory of Adversary aircraft (A-4's and F-5's) is inadequate in both number and capability. The Navy has a requirement for 36 supersonic Adversary aircraft, but currently has only 12 supersonic F-5E's in the inventory. The Navy has therefore proposed, beginning in fiscal year 1984, to procure replacement Adversary aircraft. The committee supports this effort and recommends authorization of an additional $50.0 million to procure Navy Adversary aircraft. The committee recommends a total authorization of $116.8 million for the procurement of Navy Adversary aircraft.

The committee also directs that $28.7 million authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1984 for the procurement of Adversary aircraft be combined with funds authorized for this purpose in fiscal year 1985. The committee recognizes that this will require the Navy to cancel the Request for Proposals (RFP) published in connection with the fiscal year 1984 appropriation. It is the committee's intent that these funds be combined with fiscal year 1985 funds to expand the number of eligible candidate aircraft, and to enable the Navy to take advantage of economies associated with larger quantity procurements.

The committee believes that there may be economies realized if both the Navy and Air Force undertake to modernize their Aggressor/Adversary aircraft with a common replacement aircraft. The committee therefore directs the Secretatry of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services by October 1, 1984 detailing their plans to modernize the current inventory of Aggressor/Adversary aircraft. This report should also address the economic and operational benefits of forming a single joint program capable of meeting the needs of both services.

NAVAL RESERVE AIRLIFT MODERNIZATION

The committee has supported the timely modernization of the Naval Reserve Fleet Logistics Support Squadrons through the procurement of new and used C-9/DC-9 type aircraft to replace the aging C-118 aircraft in these units. These squadrons represent 100 percent of the Navy's organic transport capability and play an important role in maintaining the combat effectiveness of both our active and reserve naval forces. For example, one Naval Reserve Fleet Support Squadron was involved in evacuation of U.S. military personnel wounded in the terrorist bombing in Beirut, Lebanon.

In fiscal year 1983, Congress authorized and appropriated funds to accelerate the modernization program of these squadrons, so as to avoid the loss of this organic airlift capability as well as of the hundreds of skilled pilots and enlisted personnel of these squadrons. The Navy was directed to obtain aircraft from the used aircraft market as soon as possible to prevent the disestablishment of any squadrons, especially since the last C-118's are scheduled to retire in mid-fiscal year 1985.

The committee has learned, however, that current conditions in the used aircraft market cast serious doubts whether sufficient numbers of DC-9 type aircraft can be obtained as quickly as needed to prevent the loss of the Naval Reserve squadrons. To reduce the risk of this loss occurring, the committee requests that the Navy develop alternative modernization programs for these squadrons, along with costs, schedules, and assessments of the advantages and disadvantages of each program, and submit these alternatives as soon as possible to the committee. These programs should include options structured around procurement of used 727-type aircraft and conversion of older P-3A/B-type aircraft in the Navy inventory or in storage. The Navy should submit these alternative programs to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than November 1, 1984.

UC-12B AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $32.0 million for the procurement of 12 UC-12B aircraft for the Navy. The UC-12B is a twin turbo prop aircraft which will provide administrative support to fleet commands, subordinate units, shore facilities and research organizations.

The committee is concerned that these aircraft are being procured on a sole source basis without the benefit of competition. The committee believes that a more favorable price could be obtained if the program were competed among the various manufacturers of this type aircraft. The Navy has already procured 66 UC-12B's and projects a future requirement for 48 more aircraft. The committee is not opposed to the procurement of aircraft to perform the UC-12B missions, however, it does insist that any future procurement of these aircraft be on a competitive basis.

The committee recommends that no funds be authorized for the procurement of Navy UC-12B aircraft until the administration submits a plan to procure them on a competitive basis.

NAVY COMMON EJECTION SEAT

The committee strongly endorses the Navy's plans to develop and competitively procure the Common Ejection Seat for the F-14D, F/A-18, A-6E Upgrade, and T-45 aircraft. The committee encourages the participation of domestic ejection seat manufacturers in this competition as well as foreign producers whose countries allow U.S. manufacturers to compete for their ejection seat programs.

The committee notes that under existing law the Secretary of the Navy's authority to establish and maintain a second source is limited to those circumstances set forth in Title 10 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(16). This section has traditionally been used by the Department of Defense to justify the establishment of a second source manufacturer. However, paragraph (16) only applies in cases involving requirements based on national emergency or the need to expand the industrial mobilization base. Furthermore, paragraph (16) may not be used to establish a foreign manufacturer as a second source since a foreign source would not contribute to the U.S. industrial base.

Paragraph (17) of § 2304 does permit the establishment of a second source producer where expressly authorized by law.

It is the committee's desire that no manufacturer, foreign or domestic be excluded from eligibility as the second source manufacturer for this program. Therefore, the committee has recommended approval of statutory language which would grant the Secretary of the Navy authority to establish a second source for the Common Ejection Seat notwithstanding the limitations of Title 10 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(16). This language is intended to grant authority to establish a second source in accordance with Title 10 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(17).

NAVY AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $1,919.5 million for the modification of Navy aircraft.

This total included $548.2 million to modify aircraft within the jurisdiction of the Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee. The committee recommends an authorization of $484.9 million, an undistributed reduction of $75.0 million from the administration's request.

The committee recommends an additional undistributed reduction of $136.7 million from Navy aircraft other than airlift or ASW aircraft.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $1,719.5 million for Navy aircraft modification, a reduction of $200.0 million from the administration's request. This recommendation is based strictly on congressional budgetary pressure and is made without prejudice. Should the Navy wish to transfer funds from lower priority programs into the aircraft modification account, they are encouraged to submit a reprograming request.

NAVY AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIRCRAFT SPARES

The administration requested $1,609.7 million for the procurement of aircraft spares and repair parts.

The request included $284.1 million to procure spare parts for aircraft within the jurisdiction of the Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee. These include all airlift and anti-submarine warfare (ASW) aircraft. The committee recommends an authorization of $245.1 million, an undistributed reduction of $30.0 million from the administration's request to procure spare parts for these aircraft.

The committee recommends an additional undistributed reduction of $30.0 million to be distributed among Navy aircraft other than airlift and ASW aircraft. The committee recommends a total authorization of $1,549.7 million for the procurement of Navy aircraft spares and repair parts.

AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES, NAVY

The administration requested $778.7 million for the procurement of Navy aircraft support equipment and facilities. The committee recommends an authorization of $678.7 million, a reduction of $100.0 million from the administration's request.

RF-4B RECONNAISSANCE CAMERA

The administration requested $2.4 million in fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of KS-153 reconnaissance cameras for Marine

RF-4B aircraft. These cameras are currently being procured on a multi-year contract for the years 1982–1985.

A recent report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) has raised questions regarding the procedures followed by the Navy in the selection of the KS-153 camera manufacturer. One issue raised by the GAO is the fact that the contract was awarded to the only manufacturer responding to the Navy's source solicitation, thus giving the appearance of a sole source award.

The committee reaches no conclusions regarding the issues raised by the GAO. However, in the interest of maintaining vigorous competition in Defense Department procurement programs, the committee recommends certain modifications to the final year of the 4-year contract.

First, the committee recommends amending the existing multi-year contract to delete the fourth year quantity procurement of 6 cameras and to provide instead an option for the procurement of 10 camera sets. The committee further recommends that a competitive camera, identified as the CA-810, be evaluated by the Air Force to detemine it's suitability for the low altitude high speed reconnaissance mission. This evaluation is to be completed by November 1, 1984. Should the CA-810 camera fail to meet or exceed all Navy requiremments, then the Navy shall have the authority to execute the option for additional procurement. However, should the CA-810 meet or exceed all Navy requirements during this Air Force conducted evaluation, the Navy shall not exercise the additional procurement option, but will instead conduct a competitive procurement for the remaining 10 cameras. The Navy shall provide the funds to the Air Force to conduct the test and evaluation of the CA-810 camera.

Should the evaluation of the CA-810 camera not be completed by November 1, 1984, through no fault of the CA-810 manufacturer, an appropriate extension to complete the evaluation shall be provided. However, should the evaluation of the camera not be completed by November 1, 1984, as a result of delays attributable to the camera manufacturer, the evaluation shall be terminated and the Navy shall have the authority to execute the option for additional procurement.

The committee expects the Department of Defense to conduct all future procurements of aerial reconnaissance cameras on a fully competitive basis, and recommends such procurements be made through the award of multi-year contracts. The committee believes this will ensure the military services receive the most capable equipment at the lowest possible cost.

The committee recommends an authorization of $3.4 million for the procurement of Marine RF-4B reconnaissance cameras, $1.0 million more than requested by the administration. The addition $1.0 million is intended to fund the evaluation of the CA-810 camera, and to permit the procurement of 4 additional camera sets in fiscal year 1985.

GROUND PROXIMITY WARNING SYSTEM

No authorization was requested to equip Army, Navy or Air Force aircraft with Ground Proximity Warning Systems (GPWS).

GPWS devices are currently used in most commercial aircraft to avoid inadvertant impact with the ground. The system alerts the pilot to impending impact in time to take corrective action.

The committee believes that a significant number of military aircraft accidents might be avoided if similar devices were installed in military aircraft.

The Navy relies on radar altimeters to provide ground proximity warnings in tactical aircraft, however, most Army and Air Force aircraft are not similarly equipped.

The committee believes the value of these systems (second generation or better) is great enough to warrant higher priority than they are currently assigned by the services. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the current priorities placed by each of the services on these devices and to consider a comprehensive program to address the existing deficiencies.

NAVY AIRCRAFT, ON-BOARD OXYGEN GENERATING SYSTEM (OBOGS) AND ON-BOARD INERT GAS GENERATING SYSTEM (OBIGGS)

The Navy and Marine Corps have shown interest in the On-board Oxygen Generating System (OBOGS) and On-board Inert Gas Generating System (OBIGGS). Both systems use molecular sieve technology to generate oxygen or nitrogen for use on-board the host aircraft. These systems appear to offer significant advantages in operational readiness, safety, logistics and long-term cost.

The committee notes, however, that only the AV-8 Harrier has the OBOGS installed, other new aircraft are being produced without either of these systems. The Navy's plans for these systems are not clear but the committee is concerned that they are not being given proper attention, particularly in view of the potential benefits in crew safety and operational readiness.

The committee requests the Navy provide a report detailing the Navy's plans, including projected funding, for incorporating OBOGS aor OBIGGS systems in Navy aircraft. In the case of the AV-8, the report shall include a detailed assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the system, and the cost benefits, if any, and shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 1985.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Ballistic missiles:						
UGM-73A (C-3) Poseidon		$5.5				$5.5
UGM-96A (C-4) Trident I		(183.9)		(−5.0)		(178.9)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−20.1)		(........)		(−20.1)
Net		163.8		−5.0		158.8
Trident II		138.5				138.5
Trident II advance procurement (CY)		24.4				24.4
Modification of missiles:						
UGM-73A (C-3) Poseidon mods		25.2				25.2
Support equipment and facilities:						
Spares and repair parts		3.8				3.8
Missile industrial facilities		4.0				4.0
Astronautics		14.6				14.6
Total, ballistic missiles		379.8		(−5.0)		(374.8)
Other missiles:						
BGM-109 Tomahawk	180	(547.4)			180	(547.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−15.3)				(−15.3)
Net		532.1				532.1
BGM-109 Tomahawk advance procurement (CY)		28.0				28.0
AIM/RIM-7 F/M Sparrow	1,250	258.0			1,250	258.0
AIM-9L/ML Sidewinder	1,000	68.6		−10.0	1,000	58.6
AIM-54A/C (Phoenix)	400	(434.1)	−60	(−50.0)	340	(348.1)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−27.1)		(........)		(−27.1)
Net		407.0		−50.0		357.0
AIM-54A/C (Phoenix) advance procurement (CY)		36.8				
AGM-84A Harpoon	354	327.1			354	327.1
AGM-88A HARM	803	309.7			803	309.7
RIM-66B standard MR	650	206.3	−50	−16.0	600	190.3
RIM-66C standard MR	475	313.6			475	313.6
RIM-67B standard ER	255	186.7			255	186.7
RAM	30	18.0			30	18.0
Hellfire	438	25.2			438	25.2
Laser Maverick	600	110.6			600	110.6
IIR Maverick	190	29.7	−160	−20.0	30	9.7
Aerial targets		60.5				60.5
Other missile support		6.7				6.7
Modification of missiles:						
AIM/RIM-7E/F Sparrow mod		2.4				2.4
AIM-9 Sidewinder mod		32.1				32.1
AIM-54A/C Phoenix mod		4.6				4.6
AGM-84A Harpoon mod		16.7				16.7
Standard missiles mod		6.2				6.2
Support equipment and facilities:						
Spares and repair parts		150.0		−10.0		140.0
Weapons industrial facilities		27.4				27.4
Fleet satellite communications		51.4				51.4
Ordnance support equipment		13.5				13.5
Total, other missiles		(3,229.0)		(−106.0)		(3,123.0)
Torpedoes and related equipment:						
Torpedo MK-48	144	127.7	−36	−38.7	108	89.0
Torpedo MK-46 (MYP)	1,565	(285.9)			1,565	(285.9)

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−29.9)				(−29.9)
Net		256.0				256.0
MK-60 Captor	300	128.5			300	128.5
Mobile target MK-30	6	21.3			6	21.3
MK-38 Mini mobile target	1,200	2.5			1,200	2.5
ASROC		25.9				25.9
Mods of torpedoes and related equipment:						
Mobile mine MK-67	280	22.6				22.6
Torpedo MK-46 mods		2.3				2.3
Torpedo MK-48 mods	23	108.9	+21	+15.0	44	123.9
Captor mods		5.7				5.7
Swimmer weapon system		1.6				1.6
Support Equipment:						
Torpedo support equipment		46.5				46.5
ASW range support		24.8				24.8
Spares and repair parts		24.7				24.7
Total, torpedoes and related equipment		(799.0)		(−23.7)		(775.3)
Other weapons:						
MK-15 Close in weapons system	51	163.9			51	163.9
MK-75 76mm gun mount	4	10.9			4	10.9
MK-19 40mm machinegun	58	2.0			58	2.0
25mm gun mount	17	3.1			17	3.1
Small arms and weapons		3.5		−3.2		.3
Modification of guns and gun mounts:						
CIWS mods		30.3				30.3
5"/54 gun mount mods		6.2				6.2
3"/50 gun mount mods		.4				.4
MK-75 76mm gun mount mods		2.7				2.7
Coast Guard gun support program		5.5				5.5
Mods under $900,000		1.2				1.2
Support equipment:						
Gun support equipment		.6				.6
Spares and repair parts		12.8				12.8
Facilities/contract suport				−12.0		−12.0
Total, other weapons		243.1		(−38.2)		(204.9)
Undistributed reduction				−35.0		−35.0
Total, weapons procurement, Navy		4,650.9		−184.9		4,466.0

TRIDENT I

The administration requested $41.199 million for research and development funds in support of the Trident submarine program, including test and evaluation of ship systems, continuation of the Trident class improvement program, and east coast base development. In addition, $163.8 million in procurement was requested for the Trident I missile program. Although last year was the last year of unit production of the Trident I missile, there remains a requirement for instrumentation, production support of the missile and guidance subsystems, and components such as reentry body shells and fusing assemblies.

The committee recommends $30.0 million for Trident I research and development, a reduction of $11.199 million, and $158.8 million for Trident I procurement, a reduction of $5.0 million. The committee was advised that recent contract award savings are available to offset fiscal year 1985 procurement requirements.

TOMAHAWK

The administration requested $81.5 million for research and development, and $532.1 million for procurement of 180 Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCM) in fiscal year 1985. In addition, $28.0 million was requested for advance procurement.

The Tomahawk missile is a subsonic SLCM designed for deployment on a variety of surface and sub-surface platforms. Tomahawk will be available in conventional anti-ship (TASM), and both conventional (TLAM/C) and nuclear (TLAM/N) land-attack variants. Tomahawk will provide the U.S. Navy with a dispersed, flexible and survivable capability to strike enemy targets at long ranges.

Last year, the committee expressed serious concerns about management and testing problems experienced in the Tomahawk program. The committee recommended significant modifications to the program, and indicated that it might consider termination of the Tomahawk program if these problems were not resolved. This year, the committee notes that significant progress has been made in resolving these problems. Prior to January 1, 1983, over 50 percent of all Tomahawk tests had been failures. Since the Navy restructured the program in January 1983, 18 of 24 tests have been fully successful. These test results are indicative of management improvements in all aspects of the Tomahawk program.

The committee notes that although the Tomahawk program was not dual-sourced in fiscal year 1984 as earlier planned, considerable progress has been made in preparing for a full up dual source competition. The committee supports dual sourcing of the Tomahawk program as a means both to reduce costs and to maintain product quality and reliability.

The committee recommends that the request for Tomahawk procurement be funded fully, and that $75.13 million be provided for research and development.

AIM-7M SPARROW

The administration requested $258.0 million for the procurement of 1,250 AIM-7M missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1985.

The AIM-7M Sparrow missile is a joint Navy/Air Force, medium range, air-to-air, radar guided missile.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Sparrow missiles.

AIM-9M SIDEWINDER

The administration requested $68.6 million for the procurement of 1,000 AIM-9M Sidewinder missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1985.

The AIM-9M Sidewinder is a joint Navy/Air Force short-range, air-to-air missile with heat seeking (infra-red) guidance. The AIM-9M is the newest version of this very successful air-to-air missile.

The Navy has identified prior year authorized funds which may be expended to procure missiles in fiscal year 1985. The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $58.6 million for the procurement of Sidewinder missiles, a reduction of $10.0 million from the administration's request.

AIM-54C PHOENIX MISSILE

The administration requested $407.0 million for the procurement of 400 AIM-54C Phoenix missiles in fiscal year 1985 and $36.8 million in advance procurement funds for fiscal year 1986.

The AIM-54C Phoenix is a supersonic, all weather, long-range air-to-air missile with semi-active midcourse guidance and an active terminal seeker. The AIM-54C incorporates advanced digital electronics and an improved target detector designed to enhance current operational capabilities.

During the operational evaluation of the AIM-54C Phoenix, reliability problems were identified which lead the Navy to expect there will be delays in the production of the missile. The committee therefore recommends a reduction of $50.0 million and 60 missiles from the administration's request. The committee recommends an authorization of $357.0 million for the procurement of 340 AIM-54C Phoenix missiles in fiscal year 1985 and $36.8 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1986.

AGM-84 HARPOON

The administration requested $327.1 million for the procurement of 354 AGM-84 Harpoon missiles.

The AGM-84 Harpoon is an air, surface, and submarine-launched anti-ship missile. The Harpoon is presently planned for use aboard the P-3, S-3, A-6, and F/A-18 aircraft, as well as several surface combatants.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Harpoon missiles.

AGM-88 HARM (HIGH SPEED ANTI-RADIATION MISSILE)

The administration requested $309.7 million for the procurement of 803 High speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM). The HARM is a lethal, defense suppression weapon designed to destroy enemy threat radars. It will be procured by both the Air Force and Navy.

Currently one of the most significant deficiencies in the capabilities of our tactical air forces, is in the area of lethal defense suppression. The HARM missile, which is just beginning deliveries to the fleet, will provide this essential capability. The committee believes that every effort should be made to accelerate the production of the AGM-88 HARM to ensure the survivability and effectiveness of our tactical air forces, and to obtain the missile at the lowest possible cost.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for HARM missiles.

SM-1 SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE PROCUREMENT

The administration originally requested $206.3 million for the procurement of 650 SM-1 missiles (RIM-66B Standard MR missiles). The May budget revision requested $190.3 million for 600 missiles.

The committee recommends authorization of $190.3 million for procurement of 600 SM-1 MR missiles.

AGM-65E LASER MAVERICK

The administration requested $110.6 million for the Marine Corps procurement of 600 AGM-65E missiles.

The AGM-65E Laser Maverick is a semi-active laser guided, air-to-ground missile designed for use against tanks, bunkers and port facilities. It is a short range, line of sight, day or night weapon for close air support, interdiction and strike missions against land and sea targets.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Laser Maverick.

AGM-65D IIR MAVERICK

The administration requested $565.2 million for the procurement of 4,500 AGM-65D Maverick missiles.

The AGM-65D Maverick is a rocket propelled, air-to-surface precision guided tactical missile. The IIR Maverick employs imaging Infra-Red guidance and is intended for use day or night under conditions of limited visibility against such targets as tanks, armored personnel carriers, field fortifications, reinforced buildings, revetted targets and POL storage facilities.

The committee recommends an authorization of $359.6 million for the procurement of 2,600 IIR Maverick missiles in fiscal year 1985 and $15.0 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1986.

MARK 48 TORPEDO PROCUREMENT

The administration originally requested $236.6 million for the MK-48 torpedo procurement program, of which $127.7 million was for procurement of 144 MK-48 Mod 4 torpedoes and $108.9 million was for procurement of 23 MK-48 ADCAP modification kits. In its budget revision submitted in May, the administration changed its request to $202.2 million for torpedo procurement, of which $60 million was for procurement of 51 torpedoes and $142.2 million was for the procurement of 23 ADCAP modification kits, a net reduction of $34.4 million and 93 torpedoes.

Moreover, between the time the administration submitted its original request and its revision, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives reduced the administration's original request by $94 million. This would terminate the MK-48 Mod 4 production line, leaving $33.7 million to be used for those components that would be used in the ADCAP version. The request for MK-48 ADCAP kits was unchanged.

The MK-48 torpedo is a heavy-weight, submarine-launched anti-ship and anti-submarine weapon whose current production configuration is the "Mod 4." The next upgrade is called the MK-48 ADCAP (Advanced Capability). The MK-48 ADCAP is designed to improve the Navy's submarine warfare capability against the Soviet Union's newest high-speed, deep-diving submarines. Need-less to say, the MK-48 ADCAP is one of the Navy's highest priority programs. One of the reasons for the current confusion between the production of the MK-48 Mod 4 and the ADCAP is the service's desire to accelerate the production of full-up MK-48 ADCAP torpedoes, while making savings in the near-term MK-48 Mod 4 production capacity. The latter was driven by the need to reduce the defense budget as a result of congressional direction.

In addition, the administration identified $15 million within the torpedo modification kit line which was to be used to introduce a second source of supply for certain critical parts of the ADCAP. At the same time they indicated that they intended to seek permission to combine the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1984 with those requested in fiscal year 1985 to increase the number of ADCAP modification kits they would procure from a total over the two years from 39 to 44. This would help accelerate production of the more capable ADCAP version. Unfortunately, a dramatic reduction of the Mod 4 production line at the same time would jeopardize the potential to second-source the full-up ADCAP by prematurely removing a major competitor. The result would be the procurement by the Service of a significant number of expensive weapons without the moderating pressure of competition.

Consequently, the committee recommends authorization of $89 million for the procurement of 108 MK-48 Mod 4 torpedoes, of which $60 million is to be used solely to procure torpedo main assemblies from the prime contractor, and $123.9 million for the procurement of 44 MK-48 ADCAP modification kits, of which $15 million is to be used to qualify second-source competitors for the critical sub-assemblies of the weapon. This represents a net reduction of $23.7 million from the original request.

The committee has verified that the prime contractor for the MK-48 Mod 4 will produce 108 torpedo main assemblies for $60 million and still remain competitive for second-source on the ADCAP, while the Service has confirmed that $29 million is sufficient to procure the remaining components required for the 108 weapons and to complete all testing and certification necessary.

NATO SEASPARROW COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

The NATO Seasparrow Surface Missile System project consortium was formed in 1968 when the United States, Denmark, Italy and Norway concluded a Memorandum of Understanding to participate in the development and production of the NATO Seasparrow Surface-to-Air Missile System. The agreement provided for the development of improvements to the Sparrow III missile, a fire control system and a launching system. Belgium, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, and Canada have since joined the consortium.

The NATO Seasparrow project is the Navy's major NATO cooperation project. A total of 143 systems have been procured by the participating countries, and in October 1981 there were 42 U.S. ships and 29 NATO ships with this system installed.

Questions have been raised recently about the continued implementation of this highly successful program in light of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA). The Department of Defense has indicated that under the requirements of the AECA, they will have to treat procurements of cooperatively developed and produced items by our consortium partners under Foreign Military Sales procedures. Following these procedures will lead to a perception of a change in role of our partners from full owner to customer. In addition, it will require the payment of certain administrative surcharges by our partners, thus increasing the cost of the system to them. The countries participating in this program have made clear their extreme concern with compliance with these procedures. Finally, it sends a counter productive signal regarding the United States' commitment to these cooperative projects.

The administration has requested language to allow the Secretary of the Navy to continue participating in the Seasparrow program in accordance with current operating procedures. The committee attaches significant importance to such cooperative projects and wishes this program to continue.

Therefore, the committee recommends approval of the administration's proposal to provide authority to the Secretary of the Navy to continue participation in the Seasparrow program under current operating procedures.

The committee is aware that the AECA has not contributed to effective NATO arms cooperation. There are other cooperative arms programs which may not be in strict compliance with the AECA but whose continued existence are in the national security interests of the United States. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to study the need for legislation providing the Secretary of Defense the authority to enter into cooperative efforts with our allies as a complement to the AECA.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Fleet ballistic missile ships:						
Trident (Nuclear) submarine	1	($1,777.4)			1	($1,777.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−287.9)				(−287.9)
Net		1,489.5				1,489.5
Trident (nuclear) advance procurement (CY)		265.5				265.5
TAK (Conv) cargo ship	1	(92.0)	−1	(−$91.1)	0	(.9)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−.9)		(...........)		(−.9)
		91.1		−91.1		0
Total, fleet ballistic missile ships		(1,846.1)		(−91.1)		(1,755.0)
Other warships:						
SSN-688 class submarine (Nuclear)	4	(2,666.5)			4	(2,666.5)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−404.3)				(−404.3)
		2,262.2				2,262.2
SSN-688 class submarine (nuclear advance) procurement (CY)		617.8				617.8
Battleship react	1	(480.3)		(−422.6)	1	(57.7)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−57.7)		(...........)		(−57.7)
		422.6		−422.6		0
Prior year authorization transfer		(....)		(+422.6)		(422.6)
CV SLEP	1	(833.0)			1	(833.0)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−249.8)				(−249.8)
		583.2				583.2
CV SLEP advance procurement (CY)		181.3				181.3
CG-47 AEGIS cruiser (MYP)	3	(3,126.8)			3	(3,126.8)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−1.2)				(−1.2)
		3,125.6				3,125.6
CG-47 AEGIS crusier (MYP) advance Procurement (CY)		24.4				24.4
DDG-51 AEGIS destroyer	1	(1,252.4)			1	(1,252.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−79.0)				(−79.0)
		1,173.4				1,173.4
Total, other warships		(8,390.5)		(−422.6)		(7,967.9)
Amphibious ships:						
LSD-41 landing ship dock	2	(486.0)			2	(486.0)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−80.0)				(−80.0)

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
LSD–41 Landing ship dock advance		406.0				406.0
Procurement (CY)		83.5				83.5
LHD–1 Amphibious assault ship advance						
Procurement (CY)		39.2				39.2
LPD–4 SLEP advance procurement (CY)		15.0				15.0
Total, amphibious ships		(543.7)		(—)		(543.7)
Mine warfare and patrol ships:						
MCM mine countermeasures ship	4	349.5			4	349.5
Auxiliaries, craft and other program costs:						
TAO fleet oiler	3	562.6			3	562.6
TAGOS ocean surveillance ship	3	192.9	−1	−64.5	2	128.4
TAGS surveying ship	2	(262.0)			2	(262.0)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−17.0)				(−17.0)
		245.0				245.0
Service craft		81.2				81.2
Landing craft		11.9				11.9
Strategic sealift		31.0				31.0
LCAC landing craft	9	(221.8)			9	(221.8)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−23.0)				(−23.0)
		198.8				198.8
LCAC landing craft advance procurement (CY)		31.3				31.3
Outfitting		204.4				204.4
Post delivery		179.2				179.2
TACS crane ship (Conv)	2	44.0			2	44.0
TAVB (Conv)	1	37.6			1	37.6
TAVB (Conv) advance procurement (CY)		5.2				5.2
Potential cost growth		187.0		−187.0		0
Ship repricing				−175.0		−175.0
Contract support				−3.5		−3.5
Total, auxiliaries, craft and other program costs		(2,012.1)		(−430.0)		(1,582.1)
Total, shipbuilding and conversion, Navy		13,141.9		−943.7		12,198.2

NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

The original authorization request for fiscal year 1985 included a total procurement request of $13,141.9 million for 29 ships of which 23 were new construction, one was a reactivation, four were conversions and one was a service life extension (SLEP). The new construction ships included one *Ohio* class (Trident) fleet ballistic missile submarine, four SSN–688 *Los Angeles* class attack submarines, three CG–47 *Ticonderoga* class *Aegis* guided missile cruisers, two LSD–41 class dock landing ships, four MCM–1 class mine countermeasures ships, three TAO–187 class fleet oilers, two TAGS class ocean survey ships, and the first of a new class of *Aegis* guided missile destroyers known as the DDG–51 *Arleigh Burke* class. The four conversions included a conversion of a cargo ship into a TAK(FBM) to be used to transport ballistic missiles, two TACS class crane ships, and one TAVB class aviation support ship. The one reactivation was for the third of the *Iowa* class battleships, USS *Missouri* (BB–63). Funds requested for the CV service life extension program were for the overhaul and service life extension of USS *Independence* (CV-62).

In the fiscal year 1985 Shipbuilding and Conversion account, advance procurement was requested for long lead items for later year procurement of *Ohio* class ballistic missile submarines, SSN-688 attack submarines, the fiscal year 1987 CV service life extension program, and CG-47 class guided missile cruisers. Advance procurement was also requested for the LSD-41 dock landing ships, the next LHD-1 class amphibious assault ship, and the first of the LPD-4 class service life extensions. Procurement authority was also requested for nine air-cushion landing craft (LCAC) and the continuation of the strategic sealift program.

This authorization request was amended by the President at the request of Congress. In the revisions presented to the committee by Secretary Weinberger, the Department recommended the elimination of an unnecessary contingency reserve, the reduction from four to three SSN-688 class submarines, and the acceleration of the reactivation of USS *Missouri* by funding it with resources made available from lower contract costs in prior years. The Secretary also recommended the deletion of the conversion of the TAK in favor of retaining the current TAK in service, and the reduction of $150 million based on favorable contract awards experienced on Government-furnished equipment contracts.

Consequently, the amended authorization request for fiscal year 1985 includes a total procurement request of $11,750.2 million for 27 ships of which 22 are new construction, one is a reactivation, three are conversions and one is part of the service life extension program. The committee recommends authorization of $12,198.9 for the procurement of 22 new construction ships, one reactivation, three conversions of existing ships, and one service life extension.

TRIDENT BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINE (SSBN)

The administration requested $1,489.5 million for procurement of one Trident ballistic missile submarine, the twelfth ship of the *Ohio*-class. In addition, $265.5 million was requested in fiscal year 1985 for advanced procurement related to follow-on submarines.

The committee continues its strong support of the Trident submarine program in view of the pending block obsolescence of the Poseidon submarine force, and the critical contribution of the Trident submarine program to the maintenance of deterrence. The Trident submarine, with its advanced quieting system and longer range missiles, affords the sea-based leg of the strategic Triad with a high degree of survivability.

The committee also notes the excellent performance by the shipbuilder and the Navy in meeting major schedule milestones and strongly endorses continued adherence to a building rate of at least one Trident submarine per year.

The committee recommends authorization of the full request for the Trident submarine program.

TAK CARGO SHIP CONVERSION

The administration originally requested $91.1 million to convert and modernize an existing cargo ship for the resupply mission for deployed fleet ballistic missile submarine tenders. The TAK would have satisfied logistic requirements other than the critical Charleston/Kings Bay/Holy Loch monthly FMB support sealift.

The amended fiscal year 1985 budget deleted conversion of the TAK. The committee was advised that these logistic requirements will be met by a ship currently operating in the fleet, the U.S.N.S. Marshfield. Although this ship is 43 years old, she is capable of performing the role of FBM cargo ship because of recent maintenance work.

The committee recommends deletion of $91.1 million for the TAK conversion in fiscal year 1985.

LOS ANGELES (SSN–688) CLASS ATTACK SUBMARINES

The administration requested $2,262.2 million for procurement of four SSN–688 class attack submarines in fiscal year 1985 and $617.8 million for advance procurement for additional submarines in fiscal years 1986 and 1987. In its revision, the administration requested $1,542.2 million for three attack submarines, reflecting a reduction of one boat and $720 million.

The *Los Angeles* SSN–688 class attack submarines are designed to destroy enemy surface ships and submarines while operating in direct support of U.S. forces or in a detached status. The SSN–688 weapons include MK–48 torpedoes and Harpoon and Tomahawk cruise missiles. After modification, this class will be capable of vertically launching cruise missiles from separate vertical launch system (VLS) cannisters located in the nose section of the submarine.

In addition, this year's request inaugurates the first of the Improved SSN–688 class submarines which will incorporate a number of silencing and weaponry improvements including added arctic capability and the new submarine advanced combat system (SUBACS).

This year the committee received extensive testimony outlining the threat to our naval forces and the role that nuclear powered submarines play in protecting us against that threat. Consequently, the committee continues to support the administration's original request for four nuclear powered attack submarines. Maintaining this goal of four submarines per year will help the Navy reach its submarine force goal of 100 nuclear powered attack submarines, and help sustain the force at as close to 100 submarines as possible during the upcoming period of block obsolesence of the older attack boats.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,262.2 million for the procurement of four submarines in fiscal year 1985 and $617.8 million for advance procurement.

IOWA CLASS BATTLESHIP REACTIVATION

The administration requested $422.6 million for the reactivation of the USS *Missouri* (BB–63), the third of the four *Iowa* class battleships. In his fiscal year 1985 budget revision, the Secretary of Defense deleted $422.6 million to accelerate the reactivation of the *Missouri* to fiscal year 1984 by funding it with prior year resources.

These funds are available due to lower than anticipated shipbuilding contract costs in fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984.

This committee enthusiastically supported the reactivation of both the first and second battleships. The first battleship to be reactivated, USS *New Jersey* (BB–62), has served her country in the fleet in the Pacific, both the east and west coasts of Latin America, and most recently off the coast of Lebanon. Her reactivation was completed within the cost and schedule limits presented to the Congress. The second battleship, USS *Iowa* (BB–61), was commissioned recently, and she will soon join her sister ship in the fleet. *Iowa's* commissioning in the end of April 1984 was over 60 days earlier than anticipated last year and a total of 8 months ahead of her original schedule. Moreover, the reactivation was accomplished within budget and no significant technical difficulties arose.

The reactivation of these battleships includes the addition or reactivation of at least the following weapon systems or modifications:

Nine 16-inch naval guns
Twelve 5-inch guns
Four Close-In Weapons Systems (Phalanx)
Eight Armored Box Launchers for the Tomahawk long-range cruise missile (32 missiles)
Four Quad Cannisters for the Harpoon anti-ship cruise missile (16 missiles)
AN/SLQ–32 electronic warfare system
Modernized communications
Upgraded habitability
SPS–49 air search radar
Improved helicopter platform
Conversion to Navy distillate fuel
The CHT sewage collection capability

The committee strongly supports the reactivation of this effective class of ships and authorizes the reactivation and modernization of the third ship, USS *Missouri* (BB–63). Furthermore, the committee approves the requested reprograming of $73.4 million within the fiscal year 1984 budget, and authorizes an offsetting transfer of $422.6 million from prior year funds, which includes the above reprograming.

AIRCRAFT CARRIER SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM—CV SLEP

The administration requested $583.2 million for the aircraft carrier service life extension program (CV SLEP) and $181.3 million in long lead funding for the service life extension program in fiscal year 1987.

The service life extension program will permit the Navy to extend the expected service lives of its major aircraft carriers from 30 to 45 years. Despite the adverse publicity regarding problems with boiler repairs, the initial CV SLEP ship, USS *Saratoga*, was a success. The lessons learned during the *Saratoga* SLEP are now being incorporated in the second SLEP, on USS *Forrestal*, now in progress. The third carrier, USS *Independence*, will enter the shipyard in April of 1985.

The committee recommends authorization of $583.2 million for the service life extension of USS *Independence,* and $181.3 million in long lead funding for the next service life extension.

CG-47 CLASS GUIDED MISSILE CRUISERS

The administration requested $3,125.6 million for procurement of three CG-47 class cruisers in fiscal year 1985 and $24.4 million for advance procurement.

The CG-47 class guided missile cruiser is based on the proven hull and propulsion equipment of the DD-963 class ASW destroyers and employs many of the same weapons systems, with the significant addition of the *Aegis* fixed, phased array, anti-air warfare radar system, the advanced SM-2 surface-to-air missile, and the vertical launch system on ships procured after fiscal year 1982.

The committee fully supports the continued procurement of this effective class of multi-mission cruisers and recommends authorization of $3,125.6 million for the procurement of three CG-47 class guided missile cruisers and $24.4 million for advance procurement.

DDG-51 (ARLEIGH BURKE) CLASS GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYER

The administration requested $1,173.4 million for procurement of the lead ship of the DDG-51 *Arleigh Burke* class guided missile destroyers.

The DDG-51 guided missile destroyer is designed as a battle group capable, *Aegis* equipped, ASW capable destroyer to replace the aging inventory of DDG-2 class and DDG-31 class guided missile destroyers. The DDG-51 will be used as a battle group or surface action group escort and as an AAW/ASW leader of small escorts for protection of amphibious or logistic shipping. The DDG-51 will incorporate better sea-keeping design, a proven modern propulsion system, better battle protection and hardening, increased survivability, a clean low-profile design, and the first class-wide system for chemical and biological warfare protection.

The committee continues to be impressed with the expected performance improvements anticipated with the installation of the Rankine Cycle Energy Recovery (RACER) system. The committee has received testimony from the Navy that RACER has the potential to save $2.5 million per ship annually in operating costs. The committee agrees that there is a danger in too much concurrency between research and installation of the system, and agrees that RACER should be fully tested prior to installation. In general, the committee agrees with the Navy's recommendation to install RACER on the second flight of the class and beyond. However, the committee believes the Navy, in designing the lead ship and the ships of the first flight of this class, must take into consideration the retrofits of these ships with the RACER system, and by that the committee means the ships should be designed to accommodate an inexpensive retrofit of RACER without extensive or expensive rip-out or modification. Moreover, the committee recommends the RACER system be installed as soon as possible in an at-sea test platform to determine formally the feasibility of the system and to validate its predicted performance.

The committee recommends authorization of $1,173.4 million for the procurement of the lead ship of the DDG-51 *Arleigh Burke* class guided missile destroyers.

LSD-41 CLASS DOCK LANDING SHIP

The administration requested $406.0 million for the procurement of two LSD-41 class dock landing ships in fiscal year 1985 and $83.5 million in advance procurement for two LSD-41s in fiscal year 1986.

The LSD-41 class of amphibious ships is a replacement program for eight LSD-28 class ships scheduled to retire in the 1983-1989 period. The LSD-41 will transport and launch amphibious craft and vehicles with their crews and embarked personnel in amphibious assault operations. It will also provide limited docking and repair services for conventional and air-cushion landing craft.

The committee has consistently supported procurement of LSD-41s as a vital program in an effort to augment inadequate amphibious lift capabilities.

The committee recommends authorization of $406.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of two LSD-41s and $83.5 million in advance procurement of two LSD-41s in fiscal year 1986.

LHD-1 CLASS AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP

The administration requested $39.2 million for advance procurement in fiscal year 1985 of the second ship of the LHD-1 class of amphibious assault ships to be procured in fiscal year 1986. The lead ship of the LHD-1 class was funded in fiscal year 1984.

The LHD-1 is an air-capable, amphibious assault ship based on the LHA-1 class ship design. In the amphibious role, the LHD-1 will be able to land Marine assault forces by helicopters, landing craft, and amphibious vehicles. In addition to its amphibious lift capabilities, the LHD-1 will have the capability to support vertical/short take-off and landing (VSTOL) aircraft which will provide the fleet with additional offensive aviation forces afloat.

The committee recommends authorization of $39.2 million in fiscal year 1985 for advance procurement of the second ship of the LHD-1 class.

LPD-4 CLASS AMPHIBIOUS TRANSPORT DOCK (SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM)

The administration requested $15.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for advance procurement of a service life extension program (SLEP) for LPD-4 class ships to be initiated in fiscal year 1987. Seven LPD-4s will undergo service life extension.

The LPD-4 class of ships provides the capability to transport troops, vehicles, and equipment and to land them by helicopters and landing craft in amphibious assaults. The SLEP will increase the service life of the LPD-4 class from 30 to 45 years and upgrade the ships' capabilities to support one fully loaded LCAC and an additional four CH-46 helicopters.

The committee recommends authorization of $15.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for advance procurement of a SLEP for LPD-4 class ships.

MCM-1 CLASS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SHIP

The administration requested $349.5 million for the procurement of four MCM-1 class Mine Countermeasures ships in fiscal year 1985.

The MCM-1 class is designed to replace the older, obsolete MSO class of ocean minesweepers that are reaching the end of their useful service lives. The MCM-1 class will conduct mine clearance operations in concert with MCM helicopters in both shallow and deep water using sonar, various mechanical and influence mine sweeping equipment, and the new Precise Integrated Navigation System (PINS) and the Mine Neutralization System (MNS).

The committee recommends authorization of $349.5 million for the procurement of four MCM-1 class mine countermeasures ships.

TAO-187 CLASS FLEET OILERS

The administration requested $562.6 million for the procurement of three TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

The TAO-187 class fleet oiler is a 180,000 barrel capacity, twin screw, 20 knot, diesel-driven ship designed to operate as a unit of an Underway Replenishment (UNREP) group. The TAO-187 class will be operated and manned by the Military Sealift Command and will furnish petroleum products to operating forces at sea and also transport those products from shore depots to other support ships (AORs, AOEs, AOs and other TAOs) effecting delivery and consolidation underway. The ship delivers bulk petroleum products and delivers and receives freight, mail and personnel, replenishing combatants and support forces underway and in port. These ships represent the first three ships in the second flight of TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

The committee recommends authorization of $562.6 million for the procurement of three TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

TAGOS-1 CLASS OCEAN SURVEILLANCE SHIP

The administration requested $192.9 million for the procurement of three TAGOS-1 class ocean surveillance ships.

The TAGOS-1 class ocean surveillance ship is a monohull configured, twin screw, 11 knot, electric drive ship that is built to commercial standards and manned by a combination military sealift command and technical crew. The TAGOS is designed to support the towed arrays and data processing/transmitting equipment of the surveillance towed array support system (SURTASS).

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence recommended a reduction in the TAGOS-1 class surveillance ship program of one ship in fiscal year 1985.

The committee recommends authorization of $128.4 million for the procurement of two TAGOS-1 class ocean surveillance ships. This represents a reduction of one ship and $64.5 million.

TAGS CLASS OCEAN SURVEY SHIP

The administration requested $245.0 million for the procurement of two TAGS class ocean survey ships.

The TAGS class ship is a single screw, 20 knot, geared, diesel driven ship operated by the Military Sealift Command and the Navy Oceanographic Group. The ship is designed to collect bathymetric and other geophysical data required for the deployment of strategic submarines and their missile systems, as well as other fleet units.

The committee recommends authorization of $245.0 million for the procurement of two TAGS class ocean survey ships.

SERVICE CRAFT AND LANDING CRAFT

The administration requested $93.1 million for the procurement of service craft and conventional landing craft.

Service craft requested in the program include tugboats, small instructional patrol craft and floating cranes. The tugboats will replace similar ships constructed during WWII which are still in service. The patrol craft represent the fourth year of production for this training craft for the U.S. Naval Academy. The ships which are being replaced will be utilized for officer candidate training and Surface Warfare Officer School, while others will be assigned to Naval Reserve units around the country to be used as training platforms for the mine warfare program. The floating cranes will replace similar equipment built over forty years ago. The landing craft requested will provide training for naval reserve units in Texas, New York, the Great Lakes and Ohio, and are part of the continuing Navy program to upgrade equipment used by the Naval Reserve units around the country.

The committee recommends authorization of $93.1 million for the procurement of service craft and landing craft.

STRATEGIC SEALIFT READY RESERVE FORCE (RRF)

The administration requested $31.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for continued acquisition of commercial ships for the Ready Reserve Force (RRF). This program was initiated in fiscal year 1984 at a funding level of $31.0 million, the same amount as proposed for fiscal year 1985. The ships to be acquired are currently in the inventory of U.S.-flag commercial ships and are suitable for military support operations. Nineteen ships were acquired with the funds made available in fiscal year 1984.

The RRF, a subset of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, provides timely sealift capability to promptly load and transport those forces that may be expected to be deployed in a contingency or reinforcement scenario. The committee strongly supports programs to augment strategic sealift capabilities.

The committee recommends authorization of $31.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for acquisition of commercial ships for the RRF.

LANDING CRAFT, AIR CUSHION (LCAC)

The administration requested $198.8 million for procurement of nine LCAC's in fiscal year 1985 and $31.3 million in advance procurement for 12 LCAC's in fiscal year 1986.

The LCAC is a new air cushion landing craft that will permit high-speed amphibious assaults from extended stand-off distances and will greatly increase worldwide beach areas over which assaults may be conducted.

The committee recommends authorization of $198.8 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of nine LCAC's and $31.3 million in advance procurement for 12 LCAC's in fiscal year 1986.

OUTFITTING AND POST DELIVERY

The administration requested $383.6 million for outfitting and post delivery.

Outfitting material consists of Government furnished repair parts and other material, including stock fund items and general use consumables required to fill a ship's allowance of storeroom and operating equipment. Post delivery funds all work, including related design planning and procurement of Government furnished material (GFM), required for correction of defects or deficiencies identified during trials or the post delivery period.

The committee recommends authorization of $383.6 million for outfitting and post delivery.

TACS CLASS AUXILIARY CRANE SHIP

The administration requested $44.0 million for the conversion of two containerships to TACS class auxiliary crane ships.

The TACS system involves the conversion of selected containerships of the Maritime Administration Ready Reserve Fleet (RRF) through the installation of cranes, supplementary crew accommodations, and enhanced breakbulk cargo storage. The ships, with their permanently installed heavy-lift cranes, will be capable of self-unloading heavy cargo and unloading non-self-sustaining containerships and other ships alongside. The TACS ships will be maintained in a high degree of readiness in an inactive status either in the continental United States or stationed in a forward area. When activated, the ships will be crewed by merchant seamen and will be operated by the Military Sealift Command (MSC).

The committee strongly recommends authorization of $44.0 million for the conversion of two containerships into TACS class auxiliary crane ships.

TAVB CLASS AVIATION LOGISTICS SUPPORT SHIP

The administration requested $37.6 million for the conversion of one Government-owned *Seabridge* class (C5–S–78A) combination roll-on/roll-off (RO/RO) and self-sustaining containership to the TAVB configuration and $5.2 million in advance procurement for conversion of one TAVB in fiscal year 1986.

The TAVB class aviation logistics support ship will support partial activation and operation of Intermediate Maintenance Activity

(IMA) vans in transit and upon arrival in-theater in support of the rapid deployment of U.S. Marine Corps fixed and rotory wing aircraft. These ships will also be capable of conducting a resupply role upon the movement ashore of the IMA equipment.

The committee strongly supports the TAVB class aviation logistics support ship program and recommends authorization of $37.6 million for the conversion of one combination RO/RO and self-sustaining containership to the TAVB configuration and $5.2 million for advance procurement.

POTENTIAL COST GROWTH

The administration requested $187.0 million for potential cost growth.

The administration requested a potential cost growth program element in the shipbuilding account to ensure that all programs were fully funded throughout the building period and to avoid cost increases which may occur in the future.

In its budget revision, the Department of Defense requested elimination of this reserve on the basis of affordability and favorable fiscal year 1984 contract awards.

The committee recommends deletion of $187.0 million for potential cost growth for ships.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED EQUIPMENT CONTRACT SAVINGS

In the revision to the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization request, the Department requested a reduction of $150.0 million from the Shipbuilding and Conversion account.

The requested reduction was based on favorable contract awards experienced within the shipbuilding appropriation. Savings are expected in the category of Government furnished equipment, primarily in the CG–47 class ships.

The committee recommends deletion of $175.0 million for Government furnished equipment contract savings, a further reduction of $25 million.

CONTRACT SUPPORT (SHIPBUILDING)

In its revised request, the administration requested a reduction of $3.5 million in contract support within the Shipbuilding and Conversion account.

The committee recommends a reduction of $3.5 million.

COMPETITION IN THE TAO–187 CLASS FLEET OILER PROGRAM

The committee commends the Secretary of the Navy for his efforts to increase competition in Navy shipbuilding and for his efforts to preserve the Nation's shipbuilding industrial base. The committee notes that the practice of dual-sourcing Navy shipbuilding contracts has increased substantially under Secretary Lehman and has helped bolster our industrial base and achieve significant cost savings in the process. In that regard, the committee strongly urges that procurement of the TAO–187 class fleet oilers be subject to a competitive award process throughout the life of the program, and that the Secretary seriously consider establishing a second source for this entire class of ships.

COMPETITION FOR DIESEL ENGINES USED IN THE TAO-187 CLASS OILERS

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy held a competition among domestic engine manufacturers to determine which manufacturer would produce foreign-designed diesel ship propulsion units in the United States. The winner received some funding from the Technology Transfer program to aid facilitization.

In an effort to foster competition and the lowest possible price for these engines, the committee recommends that the Department of the Navy seek to compete the contract for follow-on requirements for diesel propulsion units for the TAO-187 class fleet oilers. This competition should be held only within the funding constraints that exist within current Navy planning for follow-on engines.

CONSTRUCTION OF FOREIGN-DESIGNED DIESEL-ELECTRIC SUBMARINES IN AMERICAN SHIPYARDS

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the committee prior to October 1, 1984, as to the procedures required to permit allied or friendly nations, who so desire, to build diesel-electric submarines in American shipyards, provided that such submarines are built to foreign designs and are not constructed in Navy shipyards or in private shipyards currently constructing nuclear powered submarines for the United States Navy. The committee also directs that the Department of Defense advise the committee as to what procedures will be used to insure that modern submarine technology that is unique to American designed submarines and essential to the security of the United States is not compromised.

NAVY NUCLEAR REACTOR TRAINING

The administration did not request authorization of any funds for Navy Nuclear Reactor Training.

To maintain the standards of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion program, sufficient operating reactors must be available for training plant operators. Historically, Department of Energy prototype reactors have been used to meet this requirement. However, several factors have begun to affect the program's ability to satisfy overall needs: increased manning for additional nuclear powered ships, increasing prototype age and maintenance, and limited demand for new research and development prototypes for naval applications.

In assessing the Navy's training requirements for reactor operators against the availability of prototype nuclear reactors, DOE has determined there will be a training capacity shortfall commencing in calendar year 1988. Though DOE will continue to maintain and support existing prototype reactors, it is unlikely that additional prototype reactors will be required to satisfy Navy development needs.

As an alternative to building a new land-based prototype reactor, the committee recommends the conversion of an inactivated submarine for use as a reactor training facility. Initial effort on the modification should begin in fiscal year 1985. It is estimated that the total cost of this approach would be a fraction of that of a new prototype.

Consequently, the committee authorizes $30 million for Navy Nuclear Reactor Training to be derived from prior-year savings.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

[Dollar in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Ship support equipment		$857.1		−$73.0		$784.1
Undistributed reduction		(—)		(−73.0)		(−73.0)
Communications and electronics equipment		1,813.8		−70.0		1,743.8
Undistributed reduction		(—)		(−70.0)		(−70.0)
Aviation support equipment		1,081.5		−84.9		996.6
Bigeye chemical weapon		(19.7)		(−19.7)		(0)
Undistributed reduction		(—)		(−65.2)		(−65.2)
Ordnance support equipment		1,229.6		−90.0		1,139.6
Undistributed reduction		(—)		(−90.0)		(−90.0)
Civil engineering support equipment		313.3		−45.0		268.3
Amphibious equipment		(87.1)		(−15.0)		(72.1)
Fleet hospital support equipment		(71.9)		(−24.0)		(47.0)
Undistributed reduction		(—)		(−6.0)		(−6.0)
Supply support equipment		130.1				130.1
Personnel and command support equipment		528.5		−177.0		351.5
Intelligence support equipment		(47.8)		(−2.9)		(44.9)
Computer acquisition program		(242.7)		(−34.1)		(208.6)
Trident training support equipment		(236.6)		(−50.0)		(186.6)
Undistributed reduction		(—)		(−90.0)		(−90.0)
Undistributed reduction				−65.8		−65.8
Total, other procurement, Navy		5,953.9		−605.7		5,348.2

AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

The administration requested $1,081.5 million for the procurement of aviation support equipment for the Navy. Of this amount, $428.5 million falls within the jurisdiction of the Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee. These include program line elements number 215 through 224 and lines 245, 249, 257, and 258. The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $65.2 million from these program elements.

The committee recommends an additional undistributed reduction of $55.1 from the following Budget Activities: BA-2, BA-3, BA-5, and BA-6.

SEALIFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

The administration requested $24.1 million for procurement of Sealift Support Equipment for the Navy in fiscal year 1985.

This program provides special equipment for commercial ships to enable them to perform Naval auxiliary and sealift support roles. The request in fiscal year 1985 would fund three programs: SEASHEDs, Astern Refueling Rigs, and Alongside Refueling Rigs.

Within the amount requested for this program in fiscal year 1985, $18.47 million is to be used for procurement of 160 SEASHED systems. The committee supports the concept of using SEASHEDs to enable modern containerships to transport very heavy and outsized military cargo such as Army and Marine Corps tanks and helicopters.

Prior year contracts for SEASHEDs have been awarded to disadvantaged small businesses. The committee supports the Navy's decision to meet its requirements by continuing the current method of procurement from multiple sources which is consistent with the objectives of the procurement method used and the performance of the current producers.

The committee recommends authorization of $24.1 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of sealift support equipment.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS

The committee recommends that a minimum of $10,000,000 of funds authorized for other procurement items in the Navy be used to modernize equipment on board naval oceanographic ships.

AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT

The administration initially requested $87.1 million for procurement of Amphibious Equipment for the Navy in fiscal year 1985. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $72.1 million. The justification for this revision was the deferral to later years of equipment for the Assault Follow-on Echelon phase of amphibious operations.

The Amphibious Equipment program provides investment items peculiar to Naval Beach Groups who support amphibious assaults. The equipment is used to assemble the systems that transport materiel and petroleum products from support shipping to the shore during amphibious assaults.

The committee recommends authorization of $72.1 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of Amphibious Equipment.

FLEET HOSPITAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

The administration initially requested $71.9 million for procurement of Fleet Hospital Support Equipment for the Navy in fiscal year 1985. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $47.9 million. The justification for this revision is the delay of the procurement of one 500-bed hospital until later years.

The Fleet Hospital Support Equipment program in fiscal year 1985 provides equipment for field hospitals for the Marine Corps requirement in rapidly deployable force missions. These field hospitals in the combat theater will treat wounded Marines received from organic combat medical units for rapid return to duty without evacuation where possible.

The committee recommends authorization of $47.9 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of Fleet Hospital Support Equipment.

COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM

The administration requested $242.7 million for the Computer Acquisition program within Budget Activity 7 (Personnel and Communications Support Equipment). The budget revision requested $208.6 million for this program, a reduction of $34.1 million.

The committee recommends authorization of $208.6 million for the Computer Acquisition program, which is a reduction of $34.1 million.

KINGS BAY/BANGOR TRIDENT FACILITIES

The administration originally requested $236.6 million to outfit and support the Bangor, Washington, and Kings Bay, Georgia, facilities and for new equipment required for Trident overhauls.

The committee was advised in the amended budget submission that funding for Kings Bay, Georgia, Trident II facility could be reduced by $50.0 million. Although the procurement would be delayed, it should still be possible to reach the IOC goal, since much of this equipment can be procured with less lead time than originally projected.

The committee notes its strong support for the earliest possible Trident II initial operational capability at Kings Bay, Georgia. The committee would, therefore, be favorably disposed to consider a reprograming action for Kings Bay-related equipments, should it be determined that the proposed fiscal year 1985 funding reduction will have an adverse impact on meeting the IOC schedule.

The committee recommends authorization of $186.6 million for Kings Bay and Bangor, Washington Trident facilities.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Ammunition		$460.5		−$0.4		$460.1
Small arms ammo, all types		(12.6)		(−.4)		(12.2)
8 inch HE ICM DP		(19.3)		(−12.5)		(6.8)
Projectile, 155 mm, HE, Copperhead		(0)		(+12.5)		(12.5)
Weapons and tracked combat vehicles:						
Ordinance/vehicle support equipment		.6				.6
LVT7A1 weapons system	4	3.5			4	3.5
LVT7 SLEP	240	(127.5)		(−19.0)	240	(108.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−11.5)		(.........)		(−11.5)
Net		115.9		−19.0		96.9
LAV light armored vehicle (MYP)	292	274.8		−32.0	292	242.8
Spares and repair parts		17.6		−6.0		11.6
Modification kits (tracked combat vehicles)		3.6				3.6
M60 mine plow		5.2				5.2
M88A1 recovery vehicle, full tracked, medium	5	4.6				4.6
Armored vehicle launched bridge (AVLB)		8.3		−8.3		0
Spares and repair parts (artillery and other weapons)		3.7		−.3		3.4
Items less than $900.000 (artillery and other weapons)		2.2				2.2
Personal defense weapon	9,430	3.2	−9,430	−3.2	0	0
M249 machinegun, light, squad, auto (SAW)	1,000	3.1			1,000	3.1
M16A2 rifle	29,824	14.0	−4,265	−2.0	25,559	12.0
MK–19 machinegun, 40mm	125	1.3			125	1.3
EOD equipment		.3				.3
Launcher assault rocket 83mm (SMAW)	600	5.2			600	5.2
Total, weapons and tracked combat vehicles		(467.4)		(−70.8)		(396.6)
Guided missiles and equipment:						
HAWK	500	125.1			500	125.1
HAWK mod		18.5				18.5
Stinger	800	75.6			800	75.6
TOW (MYP)	3,822	56.1			3,822	56.1
Spares and repair parts		7.3		−1.0		6.3
Modification kits		.6				.6
Total, guided missiles and equipment		(283.2)		(−1.0)		(282.2)
Communications and electronics		295.9		18.6		277.3
Manpack radios		(5.0)		(−4.1)		(.9)
Generator set AN/USM 323		(1.0)		(−1.0)		(0)
Tactical facsimile set		(2.3)		(−2.3)		(0)
Meteorological data system		(15.2)		(−5.2)		(10.0)
Spares and repair parts (Tel)		(13.5)		(−1.1)		(12.4)
AN/PAQ–3 mod univ laser equip (MULE)		(39.6)		−1.6)		(38.0)
Spares and repair parts (Non-Tel)		(15.0)		(−.3)		(14.7)
Mod kits (Non-Tel)		(12.2)		(−3.0)		(9.2)

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Support vehicles		274.0		−39.1		234.9
Commercial vehicles		(22.5)		(−4.5)		(18.0)
5 Ton truck retrofit		(17.2)		(−5.0)		(12.2)
Mine clearance system kit		(3.5)		(−3.5)		(0)
Bath shower unit		(2.7)		(−2.7)		(0)
Water purification system		(15.7)		(−7.8)		(7.9)
Power equipment		(20.3)		(−5.0)		(15.3)
Electric power distribution system		(10.1)		(−10.1)		(0)
Spares and repair parts		(7.6)		(−.5)		(7.1)
Engineer and other equipment		197.6		−2.6		195.0
Spares and repair parts		(10.6)		(−.9)		(9.5)
Garrison mobile eng equipment		(9.2)		(−1.7)		(7.5)
Total, procurement, Marine Corps		1,978.6		−132.5		1,846.1

MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION

The administration request for Marine Corps ammunition included $460.5 million for procurement, providing for growth of approximately 9 percent over the fiscal year 1984 program.

The committee recommends an authorization of $460.1 million.

8-INCH HE ICM DP PROJECTILE

The administration request included $19.3 for procurement of this projectile. Congress has provided funding for this item since fiscal year 1981. The Marine Corps has been funded for 71,000 projectiles in fiscal year 1984 and prior years. None have been produced for stockpile to date. The Army and the Marine Corps are urged to expeditiously solve the problems that have prevented procurement of this projectile. The committee recommends authorization of $6.8 million.

COPPERHEAD

The administration request did not include funds for procurement of 155mm HE projectiles (Copperhead) for the Marine Corps. The committee recommends an increase of $12.5 million above the request.

Recent tests of the Copperhead indicate that its reliability has substantially improved. While testing is incomplete and this committee will continue to monitor subsequent tests, it now appears that the principal issue concerning this projectile is one of the cost-effectiveness.

In an effort to insure that the unit cost of this system is reduced, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy not to obligate funds for the additional projectiles unless the contractor unit price is $30,000 or below.

LVT–7 ASSAULT AMPHIBIAN VEHICLE (SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM)

The administration initially requested $115.9 million in fiscal year 1985 for a service life extension program (SLEP) for 240 LVT–7 Assault Amphibian Vehicles of the Marine Corps. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $96.9 million due to anticipated contract savings.

The SLEP of the current LVT–7 will result in the redesignation of that vehicle to LVT–7A1. The SLEP will maintain these vehicles in the force until their intended replacement by the LVT(X) in the early 1990's.

The committee recommends authorization of $96.9 million in fiscal year 1985 for a SLEP of 240 LVT–7's.

LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE (LAV)

The administration initially requested $274.8 million for procurement of 292 LAV's for the Marine Corps in fiscal year 1985. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $242.8 million for the same quantity of LAV's. The justification for this revision was that funds for ammunition, organization equipment, and spare parts were prematurely budgeted in the initial request.

The LAV will increase the ground combat mobility, survivability, and firepower of selected Marine forces. An LAV battalion will be organic to each of the three active Marine divisions and to the Marine Reserve division. LAV's will also be stored on Maritime Prepositioning Ships.

The LAV program was originally a joint Army and Marine Corps procurement of a common vehicle. The Army participation in the program was terminated during December 1983. As a consequence, the Marine Corps' acquisition strategy was revised to preserve the integrity of the original contract quantities. The request for fiscal year 1985 will complete Marine Corps procurement of a total of 758 LAV's in six mission role variants.

The committee recommends $242.8 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of 292 LAV's for the Marine Corps.

TRACKED VEHICLES SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS

The administration initially requested $17.6 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of spares and repair parts for Marine Corps tracked vehicles. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $11.6 million. No specific justification was provided for this revision.

This program procures initial spares and replenishment spares for Marine Corps tracked vehicles.

The committee recommends authorization of $11.6 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of spares and repair parts for Marine Corps tracked vehicles.

ARMORED VEHICLE LAUNCHED BRIDGE (AVLB)

The AVLB is a military class 60 assault bridge for spanning gaps less than 60 feet. The administration request is for $8.3 million to procure 13 sets.

The inventory objective is to obtain 39 over a 3-year period. This is a new start not continued in the fiscal year 1984 request for fiscal year 1985.

Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends procurement be postponed until fiscal year 1986.

9MM PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON

The 9mm pistol is planned to replace the standard .45 and .38 cal. pistols currently in the USMC system.

The administration has requested $3.2 million for fiscal year 1985 to procure 9,430 pistols. The inventory objective for 4 years is 67,879 pistols.

The Congress deleted this item from the fiscal year 1984 request based on a lack of demonstrated priority. No new evidence has been presented by the services sufficient to justify procurement. Therefore, the committee recommends denial of the $3.2 million for this program.

MANPACK RADIOS

Of the 4 items in this program, 45 AN/PSC 3 Manpack Satellite Communications terminals are requested for $2.0 million. This is a lightweight UHF satellite terminal providing worldwide data or voice transmissions.

Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends authorization of $1.0 million.

GENERATOR SET AN/USM 323

The administration requested $1.0 million to buy 144 generator sets. This set provides test stimuli for operational and diagnostic testing of electronic equipment. The total fiscal year 1985 request is for the Marine Prepositioned Ship program.

The committee recommends deferral of this request without prejudice for reasons of affordability

TACTICAL FACSIMILE SET

The Tactical Facsimile Set AN/GXC 7B provides the capability to transmit/receive handwritten messages, graphics, and overlays using existing tactical radio's and wire equipment.

The administration requested $2.3 million for procurement of 120 sets for fiscal year 1985. This request is a new start not contained in the fiscal year 1984 request for fiscal year 1985.

The committee recommends deferral of this request without prejudice for reasons of affordability.

METEOROLOGICAL DATA SYSTEM

This is an automated meteorological acquisition and data processing system. Equipment for 1 Marine Amphibious Force (MAF) was purchased in fiscal year 1984.

The administration has requested $15.2 million for fiscal year 1985 to equip the remaining two MAFs. The committee recommends deferment of equipment for 1 MAF to fiscal year 1986 and as a consequence recommends authorization of $10.0 million.

COMMERCIAL VEHICLES

The administration requested $22.5 million for Commercial Cargo Vehicles of a variety of types. As a part of the President's deficit reduction effort, the Defense Department proposed to reduce the request by $4.5 million. This revision will slow the replacement of overage vehicles and hold the program to the fiscal year 1984 funded level plus inflation.

The committee recommends authorization of $18.0 million based on budget constraints.

5-TON TRUCK RETROFIT

This program converts old M-39 series 5-ton trucks into the more modern M-809 series. The administration requested $17.2 million for this activity for fiscal year 1985, but reduced the request to $12.2 million as a part of the President's deficit reduction effort.

This reduction will have minimal impact since modification kits had been programed in advance of the depot installation schedule in order to procure modification kits before the production line is to be shut down.

The committee recommends authorization of $12.2 million.

MINE CLEARANCE SYSTEM KIT

$3.5 million for 24 LVTP-7A1 Mine Clearance System Kits was requested by the administration for fiscal year 1985. This system gives the LVTP-7 a self contained mine breaching capability.

There are none in the inventory now. None were requested in the fiscal year 1984 request for fiscal year 1985.

The committee recommends no authorization, deferring procurement of the request until fiscal year 1986 for budgetary reasons.

BATH SHOWER UNIT

The administration requested $2.7 million for 120 bath shower units. This is the first year of a planned 5-year procurement.

The committee recommends no authorization, postponing without prejudice the procurement until fiscal year 1986 for budgetary reasons.

WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEM

The Reverse Osmosis Water Purification unit produces fresh water from sea or polluted fresh water. The administration requested $15.7 million for this program but reduced the request by $7.8 million as a part of the President's deficit reduction effort.

Based on fiscal year 1983 contract award slippage, this reduction will delay the attainment of the acquisition objective for only 1 year.

The committee recommends authorization of $7.9 million.

POWER EQUIPMENT

The administration requested $20.3 million for fiscal year 1985 to fund various generators and power frequency converters. However, the request was revised by the Department of Defense as a part of the May 3, 1984 revision.

This adjusts the replacement of equipment to the fiscal year 1983 level. The committee recommends authorization of $15.3 million.

ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The Mobile Electrical Power Distribution System consists of two 100 KW panels, ten 15 KW panels and various cable assemblies which distribute electrical power to tactical equipment. The administration requested $10.1 million for 20 sets.

Fiscal year 1985 is the first year of a 2-year procurement. No funds were requested for this item in the fiscal year 1984 request for fiscal year 1985.

Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends procurement be postponed until fiscal year 1986.

ASSORTED PROGRAMS

The administration requested $155.3 million for various small items in the Marine Corps Procurement Appropriation. They include such items as Garrison Mobile Engineer equipment, initial replacements and spares and non-technical modification kits. As a part of the President's deficit reduction effort the Department of Defense proposed to reduce this request to $137.9 million based upon contract savings, low expenditure rates and program slippage.

The committee recommends authorization of $136.0 million.

UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH

As referenced in the Army Other Procurement section, the committee is concerned that the current ULCS program has not yet demonstrated its ability to meet the requirements. It is recommended that the Marine Corps carefully consider alternative approaches being considered by the Army and evaluate its needs accordingly.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

[Dollars in millions]

	Fisal year request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quanity	Amount
Combat aircraft:						
Strategic offensive:						
B-1B (MYP)	34	($7,001.6)			34	($7,001.6)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−1,443.4)				(−1,443.4)
		5,558.2				5,558.2
B-1B (MYP) Advance procurement (CY)		1,544.4				1,544.4
Tactical forces:						
F-15 C/D	48	(1,975.3)	−6	(−$25.9)	42	(1,949.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−131.9)		(--.-)		(−131.9)
		1,843..4		−25.9		1,817.5
F-15 C/D Advance procurement (CY)		209.5		−7.8		201.7
F-16 C/D (MYP)	150	(3,422.9)		(−451.4)	150	(2,971.5)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−462.1)		(--.-)		(−462.1)
		2,960.8		−451.4		2,509.4
F-16 C/D (MYP) Advance procurement (CY)		787.2		−81.1		706.1
Tactical Derivative fighter aircraft		26.6		−26.6		0
Other combat aircraft:						
KC-10A (ATCA) (MYP)	8	(575.0)		(−52.3)	8	(522.7)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−332.0)		(--.-)		(−332.0)
		243.0		−52.3		190.7
KC-10A (ATCA) (MYP)		404.0		−28.7		375.3
MC-130H	2	(88.2)			2	(88.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−5.8)				(−5.8)
		82.4				82.4
MC-130H Advance procurement (CY)		10.3				10.3
Prior year authorization transfer (E-3A)		(—)		−76.0		−76.0
Total, combat aircraft		(13,669.8)		(−749.8)		(12,920.0)
Airlift/tanker aircraft:						
Strategic airlift:						
C-5B	10	(2,005.6)	−2	(−294.6)	8	(1,711.6)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−233.4)		(--.-)		(−233.4)
		1,772.2		−294.6		1,477.6
C-5B Advance procurement (CY)		327.2		−23.1		304.1
Tactical airlift:						
C-20A	3	55.1			3	55.1
C-130H		0.0	+10	+186.3	10	186.3
Total, aircraft tanker aircraft		(2,154.5)		(−131.4)		(2,023.1)

[Dollars in millions]

	Fisal year request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quanity	Amount
Trainer aircraft:						
UPT trainers:						
T-46A (NGT)	10	(110.2)			10	(110.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−5.8)				(−5.8)
		104.4				104.4
T-46A (NGT) advance procurement (CY)		22.3				22.3
Total, trainer aircraft		(126.7)		(--)		(126.7)
Other aircraft:						
Helicopters:						
HH-60D/E advance procurement (CY)		22.5		−16.5		6.0
Mission support aircraft:						
Range control aircraft	2	16.4	−2	−16.4	0	0
Other aircraft:						
TR-1/U-2	4	(222.6)		(−52.4)	4	(170.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−12.0)		(--.-)		(−12.0)
		210.6		−52.4		158.2
Total, other aircraft		(249.5)		(−85.3)		(164.2)
Modification of in-service aircraft:						
Strategic aircraft:						
B-52		574.2		−27.0		547.2
Tactical aircraft:						
A-7		36.6				36.6
A-7D FLIR		0		+52.0		52.0
A-10		84.6				84.6
F/RF-4		213.8				213.8
F-5		3.9				3.9
F-15		130.1				130.1
F-16		77.2				77.2
F-111		206.5				206.5
TR-1A		24.0				24.0
Undistributed reduction		--		−44.4		−44.4
Airlift aircraft:						
C-5		3.1				3.1
C-141		14.9				14.9
C-131		0	+4	+16.0	4	16.0
Trainer aircraft:						
T-38		10.2				10.2
Other aircraft:						
C-12		1.3				1.3
C-130		242.2				242.2
KC-135		1,055.1		−186.0		869.1
E-3		82.6				82.6
E-4		5.1				5.1
HH-53 aricraft		2.6				2.6
Other aircraft		134.6				134.6
Other modifications:						
Classified projects		169.5				169.5
Special support projects		181.1				181.1
Civil Reserve Airlift Fleet (CRAF)		128.9				128.9
Total, modification of in-service aircraft		(3,382.1)		(−189.4)		(3,192.7)
Aircraft spares and repair parts:		5,990.2		−334.7		5,655.5
Replenishment spares:						
Tactical (A-7, A-10, F-4, F-15, F-16, F-100 engine)		(1,908.5)		(−59.6)		(1,848.9)
Training and other		(107.2)		(−10.8)		(96.4)
Airlift		(505.4)		(−10.9)		(494.5)
Common		(916.9)		(−67.8)		(849.1)

[Dollars in millions]

	Fisal year request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quanity	Amount
Initial spares:						
F-15		(160.6)		(−42.0)		(118.6)
F-16		(397.4)		(−123.1)		(274.3)
C-5B		(90.4)		(−18.1)		(72.3)
B-52		(52.6)		(−2.0)		(50.6)
C-135		(48.4)		(−7.2)		(41.2)
C-130H				(+7.8)		(+7.8)
Undistributed reduction		(--)		(−1.0)		(−1.0)
Aircraft support equipment and facilities:						
Common ground equipment		703.9		−56.8		647.1
Industrial responsiveness		78.5				78.5
War consumables		235.4		−72.0		(−163.4)
MSER		(--)		(−72.0)		(−72.0)
Other production charges		2,085.9		−107.0		1,978.9
Industrial spares PLSS		(--)		(−35.0)		(−35.0)
LANTIRN		(--)		(−72.0)		(−72.0)
Total, aircraft support equipment and facilities		(3,103.7)		(−235.8)		(2,867.9)
Total, aircraft procurement, Air Force		28,676.5		−1,726.4		26,950.1

B–1B BOMBER

The administration requested a total of $7,712.3 million for procurement of 34 B–1B bombers, including funding for advance procurement and initial spares. $508.3 million was requested for B–1B research and development.

The B–1B is a strategic multi-role aircraft that will significantly enhance the contribution of the bomber leg to deterrence. The B–1B will be deployed initially in 1986 as a penetrating bomber. It will also be capable of serving as a conventional bomber, and as a cruise missile carrying aircraft.

The committee extensively reviewed the B–1B program again this year, and notes the excellent progress being achieved in attaining cost and schedule objectives. On January 31, 1984, the Secretary of Defense reestimated and reaffirmed the $20.5 billion total program cost estimate as required by section 1240 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984. Indeed, the committee believes that holding the program to a firm program cost figure has imposed a discipline that has successfully controlled both contractor costs and service requested engineering changes.

The program is also on or ahead of schedule. The committee understands that the flight test program began ahead of schedule, and that the first production aircraft should be rolled out this fall and begin flying several months ahead of the original schedule.

While the committee has been assured that the B–1B will be an effective penetrating bomber into the next decade, the committee is also convinced of the need for, and strongly endorses, the two-bomber approach—with the B–1B and the Advanced Technology Bomber—to the modernization of our strategic bomber forces. The two bomber approach complicates Soviet defense planning, assures effective penetration for the bomber force into the next century, and maintains competition among the contractors involved in the two programs. This competition provides dividends both in product quality and cost discipline.

The committee is advised that the present MHU-173 munitions lift trailer employed by the Strategic Air Command (SAC) to load nuclear weapons on B-52 aircraft is deficient in both reliability and maintainability as evidenced by SAC logistics data, and that it has some outstanding nuclear safety deficiencies. Further, the committee is aware that the present MHU-173 design will not be capable of supporting the modernized bomber force comprised of B-1B and Advanced Technology Bomber (ATB) aircraft. The committee is aware that the Air Force is in the process of modifying the MHU-173 trailer to correct certain of the known deficiencies and to provide the capability to support the B-1B. The committee is concerned as to the economic consequences and effectiveness of these modifications. The Air Force is directed, therefore, to proceed with competitive procurement of a more simple and reliable strategic weapons loader for SAC that will satisfy the long-term support requirements of the bomber force. Upon receipt of proposals for a new simplified lift trailer from industry, the Air Force will compare the new trailer with proposals to modify the MHU-173 and select the most cost-effective solution for inventory procurement. The results of this comparative evaluation shall be reported to the Congress by the Secretary of the Air Force before the end of the current fiscal year.

In addition, to assure a competitive environment, language has been included in the bill to prohibit sole source procurement of a strategic weapons loader, or by sole source, to modify an existing weapons loader to be used in conjunction with the B-1B or ATB.

The committee recommends the full funding of the requested amount for B-1B research and development and procurement, and reaffirms support for the multiyear contract approach to B-1B procurement.

TACTICAL FIGHTER ROADMAP

During the past year, in an effort to develop a coordinated strategy for the modernization of our tactical air forces, the Air Force devised a plan entitled the Fighter Roadmap. This plan addresses new procurement of F-16 and F-15 fighters, the modification of the existing inventory of aircraft, and development efforts to produce a follow-on fighter, the Advanced Tactical Fighter (ATF).

The committee commends the Air Force for devising this logical, comprehensive approach to upgrading our tactical fighter inventory.

One of the primary benefits of this approach is that it provides a meaningful framework in which to assess the impact of budget reductions. In the absence of such a "roadmap", reductions are considered on a piecemeal basis without providing any insight into their overall implications for our defense posture. The various elements which make up our tactical air capability are interrelated and, in many cases, produce a synergistic effect which cannot be properly evaluated if programs are treated in isolation.

The committee therefore reviewed the elements of the Fighter Roadmap as a comprehensive proposal, and they are addressed similarly in this report.

To summarize, the administration requested $6,385.5 million for procurement, and $472.4 million in research and development associated with tactical fighter programs (F-16, F-15, Dual Role Fighter, fighter engines, and simulators). This request was prepared prior to the announcement of the Dual Role Fighter and Alternate Fighter Engine selections. The selection of the F-15E as the Dual Role Fighter and the decision to develop the GE F-110 engine to compete with the P&W F-100 have resulted in adjustments to the administration's request which are reflected in this report. These adjustments, and others, yield a net reduction in procurement of $762.3 million and an increase of $28.2 million in research and development for these programs which make up the Fighter Roadmap.

It should be noted that the total production quantities projected for both the F-15 and F-16 have been increased (this increase first appeared in the fiscal year 1984 budget request). In the case of the F-16, the earlier production estimate of 1,388 aircraft has been increased to 2,651, and the original estimate for the F-15, 729, has been increased to 1,356. The reason for these increases is straightforward. When the first estimates were made (1970 in the case of the F-15), the Air Force expected to field an Advanced Tactical Fighter (ATF) in the mid-1980's. It is now the mid-1980's and, as a result of budgetary priorities, the ATF is barely in the concept formulation stage. The ATF will not be fielded until the mid-1990's at the earliest. In the meantime, it is essential that we continue to modernize our tactical Air Force with upgraded F-15 and F-16 aircraft.

F-15 (EAGLE) AIR SUPERIORITY FIGHTER

The administration requested $1,843.4 million for the procurement of 48 F-15 aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $209.5 million in advance procurement for 60 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The F-15 Eagle is a twin engine, all weather, high performance air superiority fighter. It is an exceptional air-to-air fighter and also possesses an excellent inherent air-to-ground attack capability.

Subsequent to the submission of the fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization request, the F-15 was selected by the Air Force in the Dual Role Fighter competition. The committee supports this effort to develop a variant of the F-15 which will augment the F-111 in the interdiction role. Procurement of the F-15E will begin in fiscal year 1986.

The committee recommends an authorization of $1,817.5 million to procure 42 F-15 aircraft in fiscal year 1985. This represents a reduction of 6 aircraft and $25.9 million from the administration's request. The committee also recommends authorization of $201.7 million in advance procurement for 48 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

This reduction in advance procurement funding is based strictly on congressional budgetary pressure and is made without prejudice. Should the Air Force choose to transfer funds from lower priority programs to increase F-15 advance procurement, they are encouraged to submit a reprograming request.

The following is a summary of the adjustments recommended for F-15 procurement:

Aircraft procurement

−$144.2 million: reduction of 6 aircraft from request of 48;

+$123.8 million: additional funds required for engine procurement as a result of the Alternate Fighter Engine decision;

+$37.5 million: nonrecurring expenses associated with the selection of the F-15 in the Dual Role Fighter competition.

−$43.0 million: savings on engine warranty.

The administration requested $53.0 million for a warranty (as required by law) on F-15 engines to be procured in fiscal year 1985. Subsequent to the submission of the budget request, the committee learned that the manufacturer of the F-15 engines had expressed willingness to revise its original estimate for the cost of the fiscal year 1985 engine warranty.

The committee recommends an authorization of $10.0 million for the F-15 engine warranty, a reduction of $43.0 million from the administration's request. This represents approximately 8 percent of first year engine hardware cost, which is comparable with the cost of the warranty obtained for the F-16 engines.

Advance procurement

+$31.2 million: additional funding required for fiscal year 1986 procurement of engines resulting from the Alternate Fighter Engine decision;

+$3.7 million: advance procurement funding peculiar to the Dual Role Fighter selection. Eight of the 48 aircraft to be procured in fiscal year 1986 will be F-15E's.

—$42.7 million: reduction of 12 aircraft from administration's request for 60 in fiscal year 1986.

Initial spares and repair parts

−$8.4 million: savings on spares realized by reducing procurement by 6 aircraft;

−$3.2 million: savings on engine spares realized as a result of Alternate Fighter Engine decision.

F-16 (FALCON) FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $2,960.8 million for the procurement of 150 F-16 aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $787.2 million in advance procurement for 216 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The F-16 is a multi-mission, single-seat, single engine, high performance fighter. It is both an outstanding close-in air-to-air combat aircraft as well as a highly effective air-to-surface attack aircraft. The aircraft produced in 1985 and beyond will be Multinational Staged Improvement program (MSIP) F-16 C/D's with an improved radar and beyond visual range (BVR) missile system which, combined with other priority avionics improvements, will significantly enhance the capabilities of the F-16.

The committee has repeatedly encouraged the Department of Defense to increase the production rate of the F-16 to a minimum of 180 aircraft per year and is pleased that the budget request seeks long lead funding for 216 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The annual procurement of Air Force tactical fighter aircraft required to maintain the current force structure at the current force age is approximately 270 aircraft. In fiscal year 1984 the Congress funded just 180 aircraft (36 F-15's and 144 F-16's). In fiscal year 1985 the administration has requested 198 aircraft (150 F-16's and 48 F-15's) and if the projection for fiscal year 1986 is realized, will procure 276 tactical fighters (216 F-16's and 60 F-15's).

The committee continues to place strong emphasis on the importance of modernizing our tactical air forces. The Warsaw Pact, which has for several years enjoyed numerical superiority in fighter and interceptor aircraft, has made major advances over the past decade in aeronautical technology which have enabled the production of very sophisticated fighter aircraft capable of challenging our own for qualitative superiority. With the introduction of the Flanker and Fulcrum aircraft into the Soviet inventory in 1984 and 1985 the technological advantages once held by the West will be substantially reduced.

It is imperative that we continue to maintain a modern fighter force both through the development and application of new technology, and by maintaining efficient aircraft production rates. By consistently procuring fewer aircraft than are required to replace attrition and retirement losses, we have for the past several years caused the average age of the force to grow at a rate of about half a year each year. The average age of the Soviet fighter inventory is estimated to be about one half that of U.S. Air Force fighters. This trend is particularly discouraging in view of the growing Soviet technological capabilities.

Achieving the aircraft production rates projected for fiscal year 1986 (216 F-16's, 60 F-15's) would permit the Air Force to replace attrition and retirement losses and would arrest the trend toward aging our tactical air force. It would also permit the Air Force to continue modernizing the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve which, in many instances, are operating tactical aircraft 20 or more years old. The committee places the highest priority on attaining these production rates. (The committee regrets that congressionally mandated budgetary pressure compels the reduction of 12 aircraft and $42.7 million from the administration's request for advance procurement for the F-15.)

The committee recommends authorization of $2,509.4 for the procurement of 150 F-16's in fiscal year 1985 and $706.1 million in advance procurement for 216 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The committee also recommends approval of the administration's request to initiate a multi-year contract for the procurement of F-16 aircraft for the 4-year period fiscal years 1986-1989.

The adjustments recommended to the administration's request are summarized as follows:

Aircraft procurement

−$319.4 million: savings realized as a result of achieving engine prices more favorable than expected through the Alternate Fighter Engine competition;

−$105.0 million: savings realized in peculiar ground support equipment not required as a result of engine competition decision;

−$27.0 million: savings realized by Air Force decision not to proceed with Multiple Stores Ejector Rack (MSER).

Advance procurement

−$129.5 million: savings achieved as a result of reestimation of multi-year procurement termination liability;

+$48.4 million: additional long lead requirements resulting from Alternate Fighter Engine decision.

Initial spares and repair parts

−$122.0 million: savings achieved in engine spares as a result of Alternate Fighter Engine decision.

TACTICAL FIGHTER DERIVATIVE AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $26.6 million for the Tactical Fighter Derivative Aircraft program. These funds were intended to initiate production of the Dual Role Fighter once a selection was made in the comparative evaluation between the F-15E and F-16E. Subsequent to the submission of the budget request, the F-15E was selected as the Dual Role Fighter.

Initial production funding for the F-15E has been provided in the F-15 procurement account, therefore, $26.6 million required under this program element may be deleted.

The committee recommends no funds be provided for the Tactical Fighter Derivative Aircraft under this program element.

KC-10A ADVANCED TANKER/CARGO AIRCRAFT

The administration initially requested $243.0 million for procurement of eight KC-10A aircraft in fiscal year 1985, $404.0 million for advance procurement of twelve aircraft in fiscal year 1986, and $56.0 million for initial spares. In the revised budget, the administration reduced these requests to $190.7 million for procurement of eight KC-10A's in fiscal year 1985 and $375.3 million for advance procurement. The justification for these revisions was a recomputation of the specific inflation requirements associated with the KC-10A multi-year contract.

The request for fiscal year 1985 is part of a multi-year procurement of 44 KC-10A's initiated in fiscal year 1983. Upon completion of this multi-year procurement program, the Air Force will have a force of 60 KC-10A aircraft.

The KC-10A is a military derivative of the commercial DC-10-30F widebody aircraft. The KC-10A provides the Air Force considerable flexibility since it can (1) carry cargo, (2) refuel C-141's and C-5's (thus extending their range and take-off payload), and (3) deploy tactical fighter squadrons by carrying personnel and equipment while simultaneously refueling the deploying aircraft.

The committee recommends authorization in fiscal year 1985 of $190.7 million for the procurement of eight aircraft, $375.3 million for advance procurement, and $56.0 million for initial spares.

MC-130 (COMBAT TALON)

The administration requested $82.4 million for the procurement of 2 MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $10.3 million in advance procurement for 4 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The MC-130 Combat Talon is a specially modified C-130 aircraft equipped to support the special operations requirements of the unified commands.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft.

C-5B STRATEGIC AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration initially requested $1,772.2 million for procurement of ten C-5B aircraft in fiscal year 1985, $327.2 million for advance procurement and $90.4 million for initial spares. In the revised budget, the administration reduced these requests to $1,477.6 million for procurement of eight C-5B aircraft and $304.1 million in advance procurement. These revisions reflect the impact of deferring procurement of two C-5B aircraft from fiscal year 1985 to fiscal year 1987.

The C-5B provides intertheater airlift and is the only currently available aircraft that can augment capabilities to carry outsize military weapons and equipment. A total procurement of 50 C-5B aircraft is planned. The committee fully supports this procurement objective. Fifty C-5B's will add 7.5 million ton-miles per day of strategic airlift capability which will provide a near-term reduction in the substantial intertheater airlift shortfall identified in the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study. Moreover, C-5B's will provide vitally needed outsized cargo capability as soon as possible. The Air Force has consistently testified to the need for 50 C-5B's.

Although budgetary constraints have forced a reduction in the procurement quantity of C-5B's in fiscal year 1985 from ten to eight aircraft, the committee understands that these two C-5B's will be procured in fiscal year 1987 under terms of the current contract. Despite the reductions in the C-5 program in fiscal year 1985, the committee wishes to reaffirm its full support for the 50 airplane C-5B program.

The committee recommends authorization in fiscal year 1985 of $1,477.6 million for procurement of eight C-5B aircraft, $304.1 million for advance procurement, and $72.3 million for initial spares. The reduction of $18.1 million in initial spares reflects the reduction in procurement of two C-5B's in fiscal year 1985.

C-20A SPECIAL AIR MISSION AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $55.1 million for procurement of three C-20A aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $5.7 million for initial spares. The three C-20A's to be procured in fiscal year 1985 were leased by the Air Force during fiscal year 1984.

The Air Force has 11 C-140B aircraft which are used to transport senior Government officials and foreign dignitaries in the United States and Europe. C-20A aircraft will replace on a one-for-one basis C-140B aircraft in the current inventory. The 1950's vintage C-140B is being replaced because of its increased operating costs. The C-140B is fuel inefficient, costly to maintain, range and payload limited, and does not have a secure communication capability. The committee continues to support this cost-effective replacement program.

The committee recommends authorization in fiscal year 1985 of $55.1 million for procurement of three C-20A aircraft and $5.7 million in initial spares.

T-46A NEXT GENERATION TRAINER (NGT)

The administration requested $104.4 million for the procurement of 10 T-46 NGT aircraft in fiscal year 1985 and $22.3 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1986.

The T-46 NGT is a twin engine, trainer aircraft which will replace the aging T-37 as the Air Force's primary trainer.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the T-46 NGT.

HH-60 (NIGHT HAWK) HELICOPTER

The administration requested $22.5 million for the advance procurement of the HH-60 helicopter for the Air Force.

The HH-60 Night Hawk program was initiated to develop a variant of an existing helicopter to perform the Air Force Combat Rescue (CR) and Special Operations Forces (SOF) missions.

As a result of the Air Force's decision to restructure the program, the full amount of funding requested in fiscal year 1985 will not be required. The committee supports this effort and recommends an authorization of $6.0 million for advance procurement of the HH-60A Night Hawk helicopter. (See discussion of HH-60A Night Hawk under Research and Development, Air Force.)

TR-1

The administration requested $210.6 million for the procurement of 4 TR-1 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The TR-1 is a single engine, fixed wing aircraft designed for high altitude, stand-off surveillance.

The TR-1 reconnaissance procurement program has been restructured postponing the procurement of mission equipment (sensors) to subsequent years.

The committee recommends an authorization of $158.2 million for the procurement of 4 TR-1 aircraft in fiscal year 1985.

B-52 SQUADRONS

The administration requested $22.167 million in research and development funds and $626.8 in procurement, including $52.6 million for initial spares, for modifications to the B-52 bomber force.

The requested changes include integration of the air-launched cruise missile, upgrading electronic countermeasures equipment, and reliability and maintainability upgrades, such as the radar and autopilot upgrade, to keep these aircraft effective and safe to fly.

The committee has been and remains supportive of these upgrades, so long as they are consistent with the intended operational roles for the aircraft, and are installed on aircraft with sufficient operational life remaining to warrant the investment costs involved. The committee is aware of the complex military, arms control, and economic considerations that are involved in long term planning for the B-52 force, and wishes to be kept closely advised of changes in these considerations.

In view of fiscal year 1985 budget constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $27.0 million from the amount requested for B-52 modifications, and a reduction of $2.0 million from associated spares. This reduction is made without prejudice, and it is the intent of the committee that the integration of internal cruise missile carriage capability on the B-52H, including CSRL procurement, not be affected by the reductions.

COMMON STRATEGIC ROTARY LAUNCHER

The administration originally requested $77.3 million for research and development of the Common Strategic Rotary Launcher. In addition, $79.8 million was requested in the B-52 modification line for provisions to carry cruise missiles internally on B-52H's--including procurement of the CSRL.

The Common Strategic Rotary Launcher program provides integrated internal weapons carriage on current and planned bomber forces by consolidating several rotary launcher requirements into one launcher. In addition to carrying gravity nuclear weapons and cruise missiles, the CSRL will be compatible with future nuclear and conventional stand-off weapons.

In the amended budget request, the administration reduced the research and development funding request for CSRL by $8 million due to revised requirements.

The committee supports the CSRL on the basis of operational, support, and cost benefits associated with the common design. Moreover, the committee is particularly concerned that the CSRL be available as early as possible to support the internal carriage of cruise missiles on the B-52H, since this will directly affect our ability to carry over 700 cruise missiles.

The committee recommends full funding of the CSRL procurement request in the B-52 modification line, and recommends authorization of $69.3 million for research and development.

A-7D/A-7K EJECTION SEAT

The Navy is procuring the SJU-8/A Ejection Seats for installation in A-7E and TA-7C aircraft in order to improve the escape and survival characteristics of those aircraft. The committee strongly supports this effort to increase pilot survivability rates during ejections and encourages the Department of Defense to consider the installation of these seats in Air National Guard A-7D's and A-7K aircraft.

A-7D/ FLIR FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The administration made no request for Forward Looking Infra-Red (FLIR) equipment for the Air National Guard.

Currently, one of the most significant deficiencies in our Reserve Air Forces is their inability to fight effectively at night. This deficiency may be overcome in Air Guard A-7D units by equipping those aircraft with FLIR systems.

The committee recommends an authorization of $52.0 million for the procurement of A-7D FLIR systems of the Air National Guard.

C-130 MODIFICATIONS

The administration requested $242.2 million for modifications of C-130 tactical airlift aircraft. This request would fund 13 modification programs to provide new or improved capabilities to meet current mission requirements or to correct deficiencies in operational systems.

The majority of the fleet of over 700 C-130 aircraft are used to provide intratheater airlift. C-130's are also used as gunships, airborne command and control aircraft, tankers, special forces support aircraft, search and recovery aircraft, and weather reconnaissance aircraft.

The committee recommends authorization of $242.2 million in fiscal year 1985 for the modification of C-130 aircraft.

KC-135 REENGINING (CFM-56)

The administration's fiscal year 1985 budget requested a total of $1,103.5 million, including spares, to reengine 53 KC-135 aircraft with CFM-56 engines and associated modifications. These modifications, which include new nose landing gear and improved avionics communications equipment, will significantly improve the fueling capability and operational reliability of the KC-135 aircraft.

The administration's revised budget request recommended a reduction of $273.0 million, or 17 CFM-56 kits, from the original request. The committee, strongly supports the KC-135 reengining program as the most effective means of upgrading the Air Force's tanker force and therefore recommends the authorization of $910.3 million for 43 KC-135 reengining kits, associated modifications, and spares.

CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET (CRAF) ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

The administration requested $128.9 million in fiscal year 1985 for the CRAF Enhancement program. This funding level would provide for the modification of four commercial, widebody, passenger aircraft.

Under the CRAF program, there are 206 long-range, passenger aircraft and 102 long-range cargo-carrying aircraft from U.S. commercial airlines committed to use by the Department of Defense in time of war or national emergency. The CRAF Enhancement program would modify widebody passenger aircraft to enable them to carry cargo in a crisis. This program is the least costly method of increasing U.S. cargo airlift capabilities, costing only one-sixth as much as acquiring and operating dedicated military airlift.

During September 1983, a contract was awarded to Pan American Airways for the modification of one B-747 aircraft with options for 18 additional B-747's. At present, five aircraft are being modified under this contract. The request for fiscal year 1985 will fund the modification of four additional B-747's.

The committee recommends authorization of $128.9 million in fiscal year 1985 for the CRAF Enhancement program.

AIRLIFT REPLENISHMENT SPARES

The administration initially requested $505.4 million for procurement of airlift replenishment spares for the Air Force in fiscal year 1985. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $494.5 million. The justification for this revision was a reduction in replenishment spares for C-130 aircraft.

Procurement of replenishment spares is directly related to the readiness and sustainability of the airlift force. The peacetime segment of this account, Peacetime Operating Stock (POS), supports the individual aircraft flying hour programs. There are two wartime segments: War Readiness Spares Kits/Base Level Self-Sufficiency Spares (WRSK/BLSS) and Other War Reserve Material (OWRM). WRSK/BLSS are the stocks that the Air Force uses to transition into war and to fight for the first 30 days. OWRM are stocks required to sustain the forces at wartime levels after WRSK/BLSS is exhausted and until production can satisfy wartime consumption.

The Air Force has placed high priority on the procurement of airlift replenishment spares in an effort to improve the sustainability of the current fleet of airlift aircraft. The committee supports this Air Force objective.

The committee recommends authorization of $494.5 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of airlift replenishment spares for the Air Force.

CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED TACTICAL MOBILITY STUDY

The committee is concerned that inadequate attention has been devoted to future tactical mobility requirements, particularly the airlift portion. The Air Force Airlift Master Plan noted that "intratheater airlift requirements have not been accurately quantified" and that study efforts within the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense are underway. The committee is particularly concerned that tactical mobility requirements are likely to be substantially affected by ongoing force structure and doctrine changes taking place in the Army. The effects of these changes on the total tactical mobility arena, including sea, rail, and road as well as air, have not been adequately examined.

In fiscal year 1981, the Congress directed the Department of Defense to conduct a thorough mobility study. The Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study (CMMS) has proven to be a useful framework for evaluating investment initiatives in strategic mobility requirements. A comparable effort is now required in the area of tactical mobility.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a tactical mobility study, similar in nature to the CMMS.

The study should examine future tactical mobility requirements, the cost-effectiveness of currently planned programs, and other viable options which would address the tactical mobility problem. The report should be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than February 1, 1985.

C-131 MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS

The administration did not request authorization of funds for modifications to C-131 Mission Support Aircraft operated by the Air National Guard (ANG).

There is a requirement to retrofit 27 ANG C-131 aircraft with turbo-prop engines, radar, and instrumentation to allow for larger carrying capacity, operation in adverse weather, and operation with a greater margin of safety.

Consideration had been given to replacing C-131's with C-12's. However, the C-12 aircraft cannot provide the payload and cargo capability required by certain ANG missions.

The committee recommends authorization of $16.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for modifications to four ANG C-131 aircraft.

C-130H AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration did not request authorization in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of C-130H tactical airlift aircraft.

The Reserve components (Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve) provided a high percentage of tactical airlift assets, primarily through operation of C-130 aircraft. Many early model C-130's are becoming structurally unsound and increasingly expensive to maintain. The tactical airlift of the Reserve components needs to be modernized to be capable of forward delivery of the Army's troops and supplies in combat situations.

Due to aircraft attrition, the active force of C-130's needs to be augmented to bring certain squadrons to full strength.

The committee, therefore, recommends authorization of $186.3 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of 10 C-130H aircraft and $7.8 million in initial spares. Eight of these C-130's would be assigned to the Air National Guard; the remaining two aircraft would be assigned to the active force.

GROUND PROXIMITY WARNING SYSTEM

No authorization was requested to equip Army, Navy or Air Force aircraft with Ground Proximity Warning Systems (GPWS). GPWS devices are currently used in most commercial aircraft to avoid inadvertant impact with the ground. The system alerts the pilot to impending impact in time to take corrective action.

The committee believes that a significant number of military aircraft accidents might be avoided if similar devices were installed in military aircraft.

The Navy relies on radar altimeters to provide ground proximity warning in tactical aircraft; however, most Army and Air Force aircraft are not similarly equipped.

The committee believes the value of these systems (second generation or better) is great enough to warrant higher priority than they are currently assigned by the services. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the current priorities placed by each of the services on these devices and to consider a comprehensive program to address the existing deficiencies.

ON-BOARD OXYGEN GENERATING SYSTEM (OBOGS) AND ON-BOARD INERT GAS GENERATING SYSTEM (OBIGGS)

The Air Force has shown interest in both the On-board Oxygen Generating System (OBOGS) and On-board Inert Gas Generating System (OBIGGS). Both systems use molecular sieve technology to generate oxygen or nitrogen for use on-board the host aircraft. Both systems appear to offer significant advantages in operational readiness, safety, logistics and long-term cost.

The committee notes that only in the case of the B–1 has the Air Force made a commitment to install the OBOGS. The Air Force's plans for these systems are not clear, but the committee is concerned that they are not being given proper attention, particularly in view of the potential benefits in crew safety and operational readiness.

The committee requests the Air Force provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services detailing the Air Force's plans, including projected funding, for incorporating OBOGS or OBIGGS systems in Air Force aircraft. In the case of the B–1, the report shall include a detailed statement of the status of that program including a forecast of any long-term cost benefits, and any problems that have been encountered, and shall be submitted by January 1, 1985.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Ballistic missiles:						
Strategic: Peacekeeper (M-X)	40	$2,938.9	−19	−$550.0	21	$2,388.9
Other missiles:						
Strategic: Air launch cruise missile		74.0				74.0
Tactical:						
AIM-7F/M Sparrow		0	+600	+130.0	600	130.0
AGM-65D Maverick	4,500	565.2	−1,900	−205.6	2,600	359.6
AGM-65D Maverick advance procurement (CY)		0		+15.0		15.0
Harpoon	85	40.3			85	40.3
AGM-88A HARM	871	326.3			871	326.3
Rapier		7.6				7.6
AMRAAM	174	(377.5)	−124	(−275.0)	50	(102.5)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−29.4)		(.........)		(−29.4)
Net		348.1		−275.0		73.1
AMRAAM advance procurement (CY)		64.9		−29.9		35.0
Ground launch cruise missile	120	(580.2)			120	(580.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−23.0)				(−23.0)
Net		557.2				557.2
Ground launch cruise missile advance procurement (CY)		13.9				13.9
Stinger	156	12.9			156	12.9
Target drones		37.5				37.5
Tactical drones		38.9				38.9
Total, other missiles		(2,086.9)		(−365.5)		(1,721.4)
Modification of in-service missiles:						
Class IV		121.4				121.4
Class V: Updated ALCM		5.7				5.7
Update:						
Updated ALCM		8.3				8.3
Ground launch cruise missile update		26.8				26.8
Total, modification of in-service missiles		(162.3)				(162.3)
Missile spares and repair parts		639.8		−24.5		615.3
AMRAAM		(20.1)		(−20.1)		(0)
AGM-65D Maverick		(32.5)		(−4.4)		(28.1)
Other support:						
Space programs:						
Spaceborne equipment (COMSE)		32.7				32.7
Global positioning (MYP)	6	(223.3)			6	(223.3)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−74.1)				(−74.1)
Net		149.3				149.3
Global positioning (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		183.0				183.0

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Space launch support (MYP)		(116.4)				(116.4)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−7.5)				(−7.5)
Net		108.9				108.9
Space launch support (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		99.1		−19.0		80.1
Defense meteorological sat program (MYP)	2	(170.6)			2	(170.6)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−30.7)				(−30.7)
Net		139.9				139.9
Defense support program		48.9				48.9
Defense sat communication system (MYP)	2	(224.2)			2	(224.2)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−23.2)				(−23.2)
Net		201.0				201.0
Defense satellite communication system (MYP) advance procurement (CY)		90.2				90.2
Space boosters		25.3				25.3
Space defense system		(84.5)				(84.5)
Less: Advance procurement (PY)		(−19.3)				(−19.3)
Net		65.2				65.2
Space defense system advance procurement (CY)		17.8				17.8
Space shuttle		137.9				137.9
Industrial facilities		31.4				31.4
Special programs:						
Other programs		160.0				160.0
Forest green		4.3				4.3
IONDS (MYP)		43.8				43.8
Special programs		1,636.6				1,636.6
Special update programs		656.7		−41.7		615.0
Special support programs		160.7				160.7
Total, other support		(3,992.7)		(−60.7)		(3,932.0)
Total, missile procurement, Air Force		9,820.6		−1,000.7		8,819.9

ICBM MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The administration requested $2,440.8 million for research and development, and $3,171.9 million for procurement of 40 Peacekeeper missiles and initial spares under the ICBM modernization program in fiscal year 1985.

The committee strongly supports the ICBM modernization program as structured last year based on the recommendations of the President's Commission on Strategic Forces. The Scowcroft Commission played an important role in securing bipartisan support for U.S. efforts to enhance strategic stability through force modernization and arms control.

Peacekeeper (MX)

The committee continues to believe that the timely deployment of 100 Peacekeeper missiles in Minuteman silos is an urgent national priority. It concurs with the judgment of the Scowcroft Commission, reaffirmed in General Scowcroft's letter to President Reagan of March 21, 1984, that "for the current and anticipated environment, a planned deployment of one hundred missiles is appropriate". While this deployment plan does not provide the desired degree of survivability, on balance, the committee believes it essential that deployment proceed to achieve the December 31, 1986 initial operational capability directed by Congress last year in order to offset significant Soviet counterforce advantages, and to serve as an incentive for the Soviets to join us in moving toward an arms control regime designed to enhance strategic stability.

The committee commends the Air Force for its management of this program, including completion of a comprehensive environmental impact statement on the deployment and peacetime operation of the Peacekeeper missile. While there has been some criticism of total cost reporting, range performance, and test plans, the committee has been assured that Peacekeeper is adhering to the costs projected last year for the revised program, and is meeting all of its operational requirements. In its initial flight tests, Peacekeeper has demonstrated its ability to meet all performance objectives—particularly in the area of accuracy. Based on its record to date, the committee is confident that Peacekeeper will make an important contribution to our deterrent posture, and that its ambitious program milestones can be met.

Small ICBM

The committee also commends the Air Force for progress made over the last year on the small ICBM program. The committee notes the substantial effort made in carrying out the recommendations of the Small Missile Advisory Group on a management approach and acquisition strategy for the small missile. In particular, the committee endorses the resulting program structure that takes maximum advantage of competition to reduce cost, enhance innovation and maintain schedule control. In this regard, the committee urges the Air Force to maintain options for guidance systems.

Because the acquisition strategy will maintain options until the full scale development decision, the Air Force is encouraged to take steps to expedite the EIS requirements associated with the full scale development decision so that the earliest possible IOC can be achieved. In this regard, the committee directs that a legislative Environmental Impact Statement be submitted with the January 15, 1987 ICBM Modernization Progress Report. This should cover proposed basing modes and suitable area locations to support the small ICBM full scale development decision. Submission of a legislative Environmental Impact Statement to support the decisions surrounding full scale development shall not relieve the Department of Defense from the subsequent obligation to prepare a site-specific administrative Environmental Impact Statement covering the deployment and peacetime operation of the small ICBM.

There has been important progress during the last year in the area of silo superhardening. Recent tests by the Defense Nuclear Agency and the Air Force suggest that silos can be hardened by several factors more than they are today. If this technology can be transferred to full-scale silos, it could provide a survivable basing option for both the Peacekeeper and the small ICBM. The committee supports continued work in this area to validate the technology.

Arms control

The committee is satisfied that the administration has faithfully implemented the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission as they relate to modifications in the U.S. START position. Subsequent to these modifications, and consistent with the Scowcroft Commission's recommendations, the administration incorporated the build-down concept into its START position. The committee believes that our current START negotiating position provides a solid basis for progress on arms reduction, as well as the bipartisan support that is essential if such progress is to be made. It is the committee's hope that the Soviet Union will return to the START negotiations. Prior to that occurrence, the committee believes that it would not be in our national security interest to enact unilateral reductions in U.S. strategic programs. Such actions would not only reward the Soviets for their walk-out, but it would also provide an incentive for them not to return to the negotiating table.

Recommendation

The committee continues to support all aspects of the ICBM modernization program. It shares the view of the Scowcroft Commission that, "these two aspects of ICBM modernization and this approach toward arms control are integrally related."

Since the strategic policy of the United States and funding for the strategic modernization programs are an essential element of our national security and must endure both Republican and Democrat administrations, it is imperative that such policy and programs have the benefit of strong bipartisan support. In recognition of both the current budgetary constraints, and the need to achieve such bipartisan support for the ICBM modernization program, the committee recommends a reduction of $550.0 million in procurement funding. The committee includes language in the bill limiting the procurement of Peacekeeper missiles in fiscal year 1985 to 21, and requiring the President to report to the Congress his assessment of the impact on U.S. strategic and arms control policies of future Peacekeeper missile procurement requests.

The committee's action provides for the procurement of the same number of Peacekeeper missiles as the Congress approved during the fiscal year 1984 budget process. The Air Force is instructed to develop a procurement program that strikes a proper balance between missiles for deployment, and those required for testing purposes.

The committee also recommends a reduction of $47.3 million in research and development in the small ICBM program associated with maneuvering re-entry vehicle and terminal guidance work. In addition, the committee recommends a reduction of $30.0 million for deep basing research and development associated directly with missile basing. These reductions were recommended by the administration in their revised budget.

ICBM MODERNIZATION FUNDING PROFILE

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 quantity	Request amount	Recommendation	Change
Procurement:				
Peacekeeper	40	$2,938.9	21/$2,388.9	–19/$550.0
Initial spares		233.0	233.0	0
Total		3,171.9	2,621.9	–550.0
RDT&E:				
Peacekeeper in missile silos		1,716.3	1,716.3	0
Small ICBM		405.6	358.3	–47.3
Hard mobile		59.6	59.6	0
Silo superhardening		219.7	219.7	0
Deep basing		39.6	9.6	–30.0
Total		2,440.8	2,363.5	–77.3

AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE

The administration requested $80.478 million for procurement related to the Air-Launched Cruise Missile (AGM–86B), including $74.0 million for residual support equipment, and $6.5 million for initial spares. The administration also requested $28.039 million for research and development to continue depot development, mission planning support and development of the improved performance engine.

The Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM) is a small, long-range, accurate, nuclear-armed air-to-ground cruise missile. ALCMs have already been deployed on B–52G aircraft on external pylons, and will be deployed internally and externally on B–52H aircraft. The B–1B will also be cruise missile capable.

The administration identified a $3 million reduction in research and development funding for the Air-Launched Cruise Missile. The committee recommends funding the full request for procurement, and the reduced request for research and development. The committee also notes its strong support of full funding for the Advanced Cruise Missile (ACM) and for strict adherence by the Air Force to the planned ACM initial operational capability date. The ACM will have longer range and lower observables than the current AGM–86B cruise missile. Its resulting greater survivability and effectiveness will greatly stress Soviet air defenses.

AIM–7M SPARROW

The administration made no request for the procurement of AIM–7M Sparrow missile for the Air Force in fiscal year 1985. The AIM–7M Sparrow missile is a joint Navy/Air Force, medium range, air-to-air, radar guided missile.

At the time the budget was prepared, the Air Force expected to begin procurement of the first production AMRAAM's (Advanced

Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile) in fiscal year 1985. However, as result of delays in the AMRAAM development schedule, the administration has revised its request and proposes instead to procure 600 AIM-7M Sparrow missiles while reducing the fiscal year 1985 procurement of AMRAAM's. The committee supports this decision.

The committee recommends authorization of $130 million for the procurement of 600 AIM-7M Sparrow missiles for the Air Force in 1985.

AGM-84A HARPOON

The administration requested $40.3 million for the procurement of 85 Harpoon missiles in fiscal year 1985.

The Harpoon is an active radar guided, anti-ship, cruise missile intended for deployment aboard B-52G aircraft.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Harpoon missiles.

AGM-88 HARM

The administration requested $326.3 million for the procurement of 871 AGM-88 HARM missiles for the Air Force in fiscal year 1985.

The AGM-88 HARM missile is an air-to-surface, anti-radiation weapon designed to destroy enemy radar units.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of HARM missiles.

GROUND-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (GLCM)

The administration requested a total of $606.9 million in procurement funding, and $18.654 in research and developing funding for the Ground-Launched Cruise Missile in fiscal year 1985. The requested procurement funds will buy 120 missiles, 27 transporter erector launchers, and 16 launch control centers with associated spares.

The Ground-Launched Cruise Missile (GLCM) is a variant of the Tomahawk cruise missile designed for deployment on a road mobile launcher. The range of the GLCM allows it to attack targets deep in enemy territory and to be based further rearward, thereby increasing its prelaunch survivability and offering more opportunities for allied host-nation deployments. Initial deployment of GLCMs in the United Kingdom and Sicily took place in November 1983. Follow-on deployments to these countries, and to Belgium and the Netherlands, are planned over the next several years. All of these deployments are subject to modifications, cancellation or reversal if a successful intermediate-range nuclear force arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union is achieved.

The committee understands that substantial progress has been made in qualifying a dual-source for the Tomahawk and GLCM missiles. The committee strongly supports a fully competitive procurement in fiscal year 1985.

The committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for GLCM in fiscal year 1985.

ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)

The administration requested $348.1 million procurement of Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM) in fiscal year 1985 and $64.9 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1986. The AMRAAM is a radar guided, air-to-air missile which will replace the AIM-7 Sparrow in both the Navy and Air Force inventories.

As a result of technical problems, the AMRAAM development program experienced a three month slip in the full scale development schedule and is likely to be delayed at least three additional months.

As a result of this delay, and in an effort to reduce the risks associated with a highly concurrent full scale development and production program, the administration recommended in its revised fiscal year 1985 defense budget request postponement of Lot I missile production originally scheduled to begin November 1985. Accordingly, the administration recommended a reduction of $275.0 million in procurement and $29.9 million in advance procurement, for a total of reduction $304.9 million.

The committee notes that the qualification of the second source manufacturer of the AMRAAM was to begin in fiscal year 1985. The committee is concerned that this qualification not be delayed. Therefore, while the committee accepts the administration's proposed reduction in AMRAAM funding, it nevertheless expects that every effort will be made to qualify the second source manufacturer as early as possible.

The committee recommends authorization of $73.1 million for the procurement of AMRAAM missiles in fiscal year 1985 and $35.0 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1986.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Munitions and associated equipment		$1,424.6		−$205.9		$1,218.7
2.75-inch rocket motor	100,000	(23.5)		(−11.7)		(11.8)
9mm Parabellum	10,000	(2.0)		(−2.0)		(0)
40mm HEI (gunship)	155	(15.7)		(−10.1)		(5.6)
40MM TP grenades	1,922	(8.8)		(−7.7)		(1.1)
40mm HE grenades	1,026	(11.9)		(−8.0)		(3.9)
Items less than $900,000		(9.4)		(−1.8)		(7.6)
MK-82 500-lb. general purpose bomb	12,000	(6.0)		(−6.0)		(0)
MK-82 inert/BDU-50	81,500	(26.1)		(−10.1)		(16.0)
BSU-49 inflatable retarder	86,004	(64.8)		(−7.7)		(57.1)
BSU-50 inflatable retarder	9,300	(12.7)		(−2.8)		(9.9)
Laser bomb guidance kit	3,500	(105.5)		(−44.0)		(61.5)
Bomb, practice, BDU-33	1,115,719	(21.8)		(−4.8)		(17.0)
Bomb, practice, BDU-38	1,737	(13.1)		(−5.5)		(7.6)
MK-48 bomb (empty)	8,460	(11.0)		(−3.1)		(7.9)
CBU-89 (TMD/Gator)	4,414	(207.4)		(−51.0)		(156.4)
Bigeye advance procurement (CY)		(19.8)		(−19.8)		(0)
Flare, IR MJU-2	100,022	(7.0)		(−3.5)		(3.5)
M-203 grenade launcher	848	(0.5)		(−.3)		(.2)
Machine gun, 7.62 MM, M-60	290	(1.3)		(−.9)		(.4)
40mm machine gun, MK-19	245	(1.8)		(−1.8)		(0)
81mm mortar	24	(0.3)		(−.3)		(0)
9mm handgun	8,500	(3.0)		(−3.0)		(0)
Vehicular equipment		441.6		−65.3		−65.3
Undistributed reduction				(−65.3)		(−65.3)
Electronics and communications equipment		2,692.7		−198.9		2,493.8
TR-1 ground stations		(108.2)		(−68.2)		(40.0)
PLSS		(68.9)		(−8.0)		(60.0)
Intelligence date handling system		(23.6)		(−4.3)		(19.3)
U.S. CENTCOM		(21.3)		(−5.0)		(16.3)
OTH-B radar		(218.9)		(−90.0)		(128.9)
DEW radar		(37.7)		(−10.0)		(27.7)
MX communications		(2.5)		(−2.5)		(0)
EMP hardening (SAC)		(11.2)		(−10.9)		(.3)
Other base maintenance and support equipment		5,002.6		−22.1		4,980.5
Selected activities		(3,600.4)		(−22.1)		(3,578.3)
Undistributed reduction				−110.0		−110.0
Total, other procurement, Air Force		9,561.5		−602.2		8,959.3

AIR FORCE OTHER PROCUREMENT

The Air Force requested $1,424.6 million for procurement of munitions and associated equipment.

The request is approximately 61 percent above the fiscal year 1984 approved program and thus provides for approximately 55 percent growth in real terms. The committee recommends authorization of $1,218.75 million, a reduction of $205.9 from the budget request. This authorization provides for approximately 62 percent growth.

Unless otherwise noted the reductions were made without prejudice in response to budget constraints.

DOD BUDGET REVISIONS

On May 3, 1984, as a part of the administration's deficit reduction effort, the Department of Defense forwarded to the Congress a revision of the fiscal year 1985 request which reduced the request for procurement of munitions and associated equipment for the Air Force from a Total Obligation Authority of $1,424.6 to $1,199.8; a reduction of $167.9 million or 8 percent.

With regards to several of these programs, the committee concurs with the reductions. The specified munitions were the subject of critical reports by the GAO and others and most were recommended for reduction by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. These programs include the following:

	Budget request	DOD proposal	Committee recommendation
Line item:			
2.75-inch rocket motor	$23.5	−$11.7	$11.8
40mm HEI (Gunship)	15.7	−10.1	5.6
MK 82 500 lb. bomb	6.0	−6.0	0.0
MK 82 Inert/BDU-50	26.1	−10.0	16.0
BSU-49 retarder	12.7	−2.8	9.9
Laser bomb guidance	105.5	−44.0	61.51
Bomb practice BDU-33	21.8	−4.8	17.0
Bomb practice BDU-38	13.1	−5.5	7.6
MK-84 bomb empty	11.0	−3.1	7.9
CBU-89 (TMD/GATOR)	207.4	−51.0	156.4

The committee does not concur with the following proposed reductions:

	Budget request	DOD proposal	Committee recommendation
CART Chaff RR-170	$16.0	−$2.2	$16.0
CBU-87 (CEM)	281.9	−43.2	281.9
FLARE, IR MJU-7B	13.7	0.0	13.7

CART Chaff RR-170 is a low but critically scarce commodity. It is the sole self-protection chaff cartridge for the majority of Air Force tactical aircraft and for all current production fighter aircraft. Increased production is required to economically build toward the wartime mobilization base necessary for this critical countermeasure.

The adjustment proposed by the Department of Defense for procurement of the Flare, IR MJU-7B would cut training allowances by 50 percent and allow achievement of only 32 percent of the inventory objective.

Production of CBU-87s in the requested amount is required to establish dual sources on an equal basis for the planned production. This munition will be the Air Force's primary general purpose cluster weapon for at least the next ten years, and full competition for this large program is critical in insuring the lowest possible total costs.

CBU-87 COMBINED EFFECTS MUNITION

The administration requested for fiscal year 1985, $281.9 million for procurement of 10,446 Combined Effects Munitions (CEM). As a part of the President's deficit reduction effort, the request was reduced by $43.2 million.

The committee does not concur in this reduction. The analysis of intelligence concerning potential enemy capabilities, the most recent munitions effectiveness data, and the current out year force structure lead the committee to support expansion of procurement to the quantities currently projected for the out years.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to accelerate its efforts to obtain a second source for production of the Combined Effects Munition. The committee also directs the department of Defense to assess the desirability, from both a total munitions production base requirement as well as well as an economic point of view, of the facilitization of a second source for Load Assembly and Pack (LAP) of the CEM. Such assessment should include consideration of the facilitization of Joilet Army Ammunition Plan and assume both government and contractor funded facilitization alternatives.

The Department of Defense is directed to prepare an unclassified report to be provided to the committee not later than March 1, 1985, which will provide the Army's assessment of the most economical course of action to procure the desired quantities of CEM.

FLARE IR MJU-2

The administration request included $7.0 million for procurement of the MJU-2 IR flare. Revised costs estimates of the Department of the Air Force reveal that $3.5 million rather than $7.0 is required. Accordingly, the committee recommends authorization of $3.5 million.

AIRBASE GROUND DEFENSE

The administration request included $20.8 million for munitions and related equipment for Airbase Ground Defense. The request is part of a long range plan to increase, organize and equip forces of substantial size for this mission. The committee recognizes that the local defense of airbases is of legitimate concern to European and other commanders. However, the committee is concerned about the dedication of a force of the planned magnitude to a wartime mission which is entirely defensive in nature. The type of equipment requested also raises concerns about training requirements and the duplication of roles and missions of this type. Given current and projected budget constraints, the committee believes that this initiative, and the associated growth in manpower and other requirements, cannot be justifed.

The committee recommends that no funds be authorized in this or other associated program elements.

OVER-THE-HORIZON BACKSCATTER (OTH–B) RADAR

The administration requested $218.9 million for procurement, and $60.9 million for research and development of the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter (OTH–B) radar in fiscal year 1985.

The OTH–B radar system was designed to provide all-altitude, tactical early-warning of possible bomber and air-launched cruise missile attacks against North America. The system, as planned, will consist of two sites with 180 degree coverage, one on each coast, and one site with 120 degree coverage located in the south. The fiscal year 1985 procurement request would complete the final 60 degree sector of the east coast site, and begin work on the site to be located in the northwest.

In the amended budget submission, the administration identified a $90.0 million reduction in OTH–B procurement. The reduction will defer procurement of the first sector of the three-sector west coast OTH–B system. The remaining fiscal year 1985 funds will provide for completion of the east coast OTH–B system.

The committee continues to support the full OTH–B system. The committee reluctantly recommends the proposed reduction of $90.0 million in view of fiscal year 1985 budget constraints.

DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (DSCS) III

The administration requested $31.629 million for research and development, $201.0 million for full funding of two satellites, and $90.2 million for advanced procurement.

The DSCS III satellite provides super-high frequency satellite communications for secure voice and high data rate transmissions. These satellites will have more electro-magnetic pulse protection than DSCS II satellites, and will be more resistent to jamming.

The Congress recently approved the first phase of multi-year procurement for DSCS III, in view of the program's stability, and economic order quantity savings. The committee reaffirms its support of multi-year procurement, and recommends authorization of the full amounts requested.

CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER

The Consolidated Space Operations Center (CSOC) consists of two main elements: the Satellite Operations Complex and the Shuttle Operations and Planning Complex (SOPC). The CSOC will provide a secure environment from which to conduct DOD space missions, siting to minimize environmental and man-made threats, and the capability to conduct military space operations from dedicated DOD facilities, thus allowing close coordination of Shuttle and satellite operations.

The administration originally requested $72.7 million for research and development and $165.0 million for procurement, which included funding for communications equipment to be used in the Shuttle Operations and Planning Complex.

The amended budget included reductions of $7.0 million in research and development funding, and $31.0 million in procurement funding related to the Shuttle Operations and Planning Complex. These reductions would delay the activation of the SOPC by 2 years, and necessitate DOD's continued reliance on NASA to provide Shuttle flight planning, mission operations, and launch control at the Johnson Space Center. In view of serious concerns about this impact, particularly relating to the launching of sensitive national security payloads, the committee recommends that this program be fully funded as originally requested.

SPACE BOOSTERS

The administration requested $25.31 million for procurement, and $20.36 million for research and development associated with space boosters in fiscal year 1985.

The space booster program utililizes Atlas and Titan III space launch vehicles to deploy critical Department of Defense payloads. There is no further procurement of new launch vehicles. The remaining inventory will be expended as the Department of Defense transitions to the Space Shuttle for space launch.

The Shuttle has demonstrated its effectiveness as a space launch system. The committee is concerned, however, by the prospect of total reliance on that system for the deployment of crucial military payloads. Therefore, the committee supports the Department of Defense plan to purchase 10 expendable launch vehicles (ELV's) to complement the Shuttle during the years 1988 through 1992. ELV's will provide more flexible and assured access to space for the launch-on-demand of critical national security payloads. The committee notes that the Department of Defense will continue to rely on the Shuttle for a great majority of its space launches.

The committee recommends full funding of the space booster program, including $20.36 million for research and development of which $10 million is to be used to study and define a follow-on expendable launch vehicle program capable of launching shuttle class payloads. Furthermore, the committee would entertain a reprograming action by the Department of Defense to provide funds to begin development of an ELV for a late 1980's initial operational capability.

NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM

The administration requested a total of $180.2 million in research and development and $353.0 million in procurement related to the Global Positioning System satellite and user equipment.

The Global Positioning System is designed to meet the needs of military users for continuous, real-time, all weather precise navigation positioning. The system will have land, sea and air applications for the civil sector, although very precise position data will have limited availability due to national security reasons.

In the fiscal year 1982 DOD Authorization and Appropriations Acts, Congress required DOD to address the development of a mechanism to recover that portion of NAVSTAR/GPS costs deemed feasible from non-DOD users. DOD subsequently issued policy direction consistent with congressional direction, and is proceeding with plans to implement user charges. Several concerns, however, have emerged that may render user charges undesirable. These concerns include the safeguarding of crypto devices that would be used to deny access to nonparticipants, potential delays in the availability of military user equipment to accomplish required changes, and the unprecedented administrative structure that would be required to distribute user keys and collect user fees worldwide. In view of these concerns, the committee recommends that the requirement to charge GPS user fees be rescinded.

The committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested.

USCENTCOM/SOUTHWEST ASIA C^3

The administration initially requested $21.3 million in fiscal year 1985 for the Air Force portion of a joint procurement program to provide improved command, control, and communications capability for the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM). In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $16.3 million. The justification for this revision was the deletion of funds for the communications infrastructure until better program and policy definition exists.

This program procures equipment necessary for a deployable communications infrastructure to support command and control of combat operations in Southwest Asia.

The committee recommends authorization of $16.3 million in fiscal year 1985 for procurement of improved command, control, and communications capability for USCENTCOM.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 request		Change from request		Committee recommendation	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Major equipment:						
OSD/WHS		$25.1				$25.1
NSA: Classified equipment		(.........)		—$24.1		—24.1
DNA:						
Vehicles		0.2				0.2
Other capital equipment		3.2				3.2
DCA:						
WWMCCS ADP systems		18.6				18.6
Defense switching network		7.1				7.1
Items less than $900,000 each		33.5				33.5
DIA: Intelligence and communications		(.........)		—2.4		—2.4
DLA:						
Materials handling equipment		5.4				5.4
Vehicles		1.9				1.9
Mechanized materials handling system		33.8				33.8
ADP equipment		71.1				71.1
Telecommunications equipment		5.5				5.5
Other major equipment		3.3				3.3
Items less than $900,000 each		.9				.9
Automated marking/reading system (LOGMARS)		2.0				2.0
Undistributed reduction		(.........)		—10.0		—10.0
DMA:						
Vehicles		.3				.3
Other capital equipment		18.7				18.7
DIS:						
Vehicles		.3				.3
Other capital equipment		.1				.1
USUHS: Items less than $900,000 each		1.7				1.7
DCAA: Items less than $900,000 each		9.0				9.0
DAVA: Items less than $900,000 each		1.9				1.9
DRSP: Items less than $900,000 each		(.........)				(.........)
DIS: Items less than $900,000 each		.5				.5
Total, procurement, Defense Agencies		1,243.5		—36.5		1,207.0

AUTHORIZATION FOR MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS

The administration requested authority to enter multi-year contracts for the procurement of 12 systems, 7 of which are defined as major systems. The following is a list of the systems proposed for multi-year contracts and the projected savings when compared with annual contracts:

Program	*Projected savings percent*
Major systems:	
UH/EH-60 airframe	10.0
CH-47 modernization	12.0
CH-53E airframe	14.4
F-16 airframe	8.4
Defense Satellite Communications System (DSCS)	19.8
5-ton truck	7.0
TOW II missile	10.0
Minor systems:	
Shop equipment contact maintenance	34.5
Bradley Fighting Vehicle turret drive	4.5
Bush Master 25mm gun	7.7
AN/SSQ-36 sonobuoys	12.7
F-16 simulator	12.4

The committee has consistently supported multi-year contracting as a means to achieve program savings and stability. The experience thus far with multi-year programs has been favorable. In virtually every program that has been authorized for multi-year funding, substantial savings over annual contract costs have been realized and program instability has been dramatically reduced. The success of these efforts stands in sharp contrast to the rampant cost growth and program turmoil that characterized many Defense Department programs during the late 1970's.

Another significant advantage of multi-year contracting is the increased level of competition fostered by the prospect of obtaining 3 or 4 years of dependable government business. For example, when the CH-47D Chinook helicopter modernization program was first proposed for a multi-year contract in 1982, the number of potential subcontractors seeking to participate in the program doubled from 400 to 800. This increased level of competition in multi-year programs should assure the government very favorable contract proposals.

The committee notes that when the administration first proposed multi-year contracting, savings were estimated in the range between 10 and 20 percent. The committee has indicated in the past, that it considers 10 percent to be a minimum acceptable level of savings. Therefore, in view of the success of previous multi-year contracts, the committee recommends approval of the administration's request to enter multi-year obligations for those programs listed above, but requests the Secretary of Defense provide the committee his justification for entering such obligations where the overall program savings are projected to be less than 10 percent of the amount that would have resulted under an annual contract.

GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

In 1981 and 1982, the committee recommended plans to provide $2.6 billion specifically earmarked for everyday equipment required by the units of the National Guard and Reserve components over the next 5 years. This plan included trucks, radios, boats, trailers, medical equipment, tool sets and all the common equipment needed by the units. Since then $351 million has been authorized and appropriated specifically for this purpose.

This year, the reserve components equipment status report required by law indicates a growing shortfall. The report identified a shortage of some $13.8 billion worth of equipment. The procurement funds in the budget for the National Guard and Reserve components total $2.2 billion which is only 2 percent of the total procurement budget request and some $420 million less than provided last year.

Therefore, the committee recommends a continuation of funding for the everyday equipment needs of Guard and Reserve units and an authorization of $90 million for this purpose in fiscal year 1985 to be earmarked and appropriated for individual National Guard and Reserve components. The Chief of each National Guard and Reserve component shall allocate these additional funds to equip units in a way that will provide the most military capability for the money. This additional $90 million is to be appropriated in the following amounts for each Reserve component:

Army National Guard—$50 million (for medical equipment, radios, howitzers, tractors, and other unit equipment).

Air National Guard—$20 million (for communications equipment and other unit equipment).

Naval Reserve—$20 million (for unit equipment and supplies in naval mobile construction battalions—the Committee requests that naval construction battalion equipment be managed by unit sets to facilitate rapid deployment and that a system of testing deployment readiness of such equipment be implemented).

The committee directs that the Chief of each Reserve component receiving such funds provide a detailed report to the Armed Services Committees on the items of equipment to be procured with such funds within 120 days after date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE I—PART B—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

BACKGROUND ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

Annual authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test and evaluation conducted by the Department of Defense has been required by law since 1963 (Public Law 88–174). Appropriate subcommittees of the full committee conducted hearings and reviewed information on various research and development program requests including, but not limited to, the following: Army general purpose programs; the MX program and ballistic missile defense; tactical and strategic aircraft and associated systems; Army anti-tank weapons and electronic warfare; the Trident and various other submarine programs; new ships and related ship programs; lasers and particle beam technology; strategic command, control and communications (C^3); chemical warfare matters; and various land, air, and sea-launched missiles and missile systems. The committee recommendations appear in subsequent pages of this report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING CHANGES

The tables below show comparisons of the amount appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation for fiscal year 1984 with the amounts requested for authorization in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985 and those recommended by the committee.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTMENT TO FISCAL YEAR 1984 RDT&E AUTHORIZATION REQUEST: BY SERVICE

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year—		Committee	
	1984 budget authority	1985 request	Change from request	Recommendation
Army	$4,259,375	$4,987,860	$−366,550	$4,621,310
Navy (including Marine Corps)	7,571,718	9,833,576	−438,968	9,394,608
Air Force	12,220,706	14,401,955	−429,448	13,972,507
Defense agencies	2,767,420	4,708,296	−200,755	4,507,541
Director, test and evaluation	49,000	62,000	−3,000	59,000
Total	26,868,219	33,993,687	−1,438,721	32,554,966

[1] Includes authorization for special foreign currency program in amounts as follows (dollar amounts in thousands):

	Fiscal year 1984	Fiscal year 1985
Army	$1,474	$760
Navy	1,376	7,500
Defense agencies	200	390
Total	3,050	8,650

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

[Dollars in thousands]

Line number		Fiscal year 1985 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
	Technology base	($787,734)	(0)	($787,734)
	Advanced technology development	(557,338)	(−$82,269)	(475,069)
49	Aircraft avionics equipment	30,259	−3,000	27,259
53	Airdrop advancement	4,965	−1,000	3,965
57	Missile/rocket components	30,119	−10,000	20,119
60	Army development and employment activity	42,517	−42,517	0
66	Combat vehicle armor/aviation	52,385	−10,000	42,385
68	Nuclear hardening advanced technology	985	−985	0
71	Manpower and personnel	17,026	−5,000	12,026
74	Human factors in training	10,376	−5,000	5,376
78	Test, measurement, and diagnostic equipment development	4,767	−4,767	0
	Strategic programs	(227,033)	(−1,451)	(225,582)
90	BMD system technology	1,451	−1,451	0
	Tactical programs	(2,329,995)	(−273,234)	(2,056,761)
95	Greater slope	58,252	−10,000	48,252
96	Advanced rotorcraft tech integration/LHX	48,603	−5,000	43,603
97	Joint antitactical missile	92,335	−60,000	32,335
98	Surface-to-surface missile rocket system	35,384	+10,000	45,384
111	Electric power sources	11,874	−4,874	7,000
128	Soldier support/survivability	7,095	−3,095	4,000
141	Aircraft propulsion system	26,518	−5,000	21,518
147	Aircraft component improvement program	14,630	−1,000	13,630
148	Stinger	13,898	−8,898	5,000
156	High technology light division	58,796	−58,796	0
181	Combat feeding, clothing, and equipment	6,290	−3,290	3,000
190	RPVs	103,140	−7,000	96,140
192	Military computer family	16,522	−16,522	0
194	Division air defense command and control	129,424	−80,000	49,424
195	Automatic test equipment development	15,859	−15,859	0
202	JSTARS	108,168	−6,000	102,168
203	Joint interoperability of tactical systems	51,849	−7,700	44,149
	Dragon warhead upgrade	0	+9,800	9,800
	Intelligence and communications	(67,572)	(.........)	(67,572)
	Defensewide mission support	(1,017,428)	(−99,596)	(917,832)
233	TRADOC studies and analyses	2,864	−2,864	0
235	Kwajalein missile range	154,765	−10,000	144,765
237	Support of development testing	52,060	−6,560	45,500
240	Support of operational testing	60,625	−9,125	51,500
241	Programwide activities	110,059	−40,059	70,000
244	DARCOM ranges/test facilities	350,988	−30,988	320,000
	Force development initiatives	(0)	(+90,000)	(90,000)
—	Armor division	0	+20,000	20,000
—	Mechanized infantry division	0	+20,000	20,000
—	Airborne infantry division	0	+10,000	10,000
—	Air assault division	0	+10,000	10,000
—	Motorized division	0	+20,000	20,000
—	Light infantry division	0	+10,000	10,000
	Total, RDT&E, Army	$4,987,100	−366,550	4,620,550

ADVANCED ROTORCRAFT TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION (LHX)

The administration requested $48.6 million for the development of Advanced Rotorcraft Technology for application in the Army's proposed Light Helicopter (LHX). The LHX is being developed to replace the current aging force of approximately 7,000 scout, utility and attack helicopters. The LHX will be a family of lightweight helicopters consisting of a SCAT (Scout/Attack) version to replace the AH-1, OH-58, and OH-6 series aircraft and a utility version to replace the UH-1.

The Army has proposed an accelerated development schedule for the LHX beginning with a reprograming of $25.2 million in fiscal year 1984. While recognizing the need to replace a majority of the Army's aviation assets beginning in the early 1990's, the committee is nevertheless concerned over the ambitious development schedule proposed by the Army. Full Scale Development (FSD) is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1986, however, the requirements for the aircraft have yet to be defined. In the absence of an approved requirements document, the effective participation of industry is necessarily limited.

The committee also notes that in each of the Army's most recent helicopter development programs (UH-60 Blackhawk, AH-64 Apache, and AHIP) the costs of the aircraft rose substantially from their initial, very conservative estimates. A repetition of that poor cost management will not be tolerated.

The LHX program promises to be the largest and most expensive helicopter program ever undertaken by the Department of Defense. Early estimates project the development cost at $3.0 billion and procurement costs in excess of $30.0 billion. Obviously, these estimates are speculative since the LHX requirements have not been defined.

The committee serves notice that its scrutiny of the LHX program will be close and unremitting. Evidence of poor cost discipline, "goldplating" (over-specification), poor design management or failure to properly fund the program will invite termination.

The committee recommends authorization of $43.6 million for the Advanced Rotorcraft Technology Integration, a reduction of $5.0 million from the administration's request.

AIRDROP ADVANCEMENT

The administration requested $4.965 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Airdrop Advancement.

This program supports technology demonstration and advanced development of airdrop equipment and techniques to reduce airdrop aircraft vulnerability to enemy air defenses, to improve operational capability to conduct airborne assaults including rapid deployment operations, and to provide an improved airdrop resupply capability for both airborne and conventional forces of all services.

The committee recommends authorization of $3.965 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Airdrop Advancement, a reduction of $1.0 million to the administration's request.

ARMY DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY (ADEA) AND HIGH TECHNOLOGY LIGHT DIVISION

The committee feels that, with the Army's decision to pursue the establishment of light divisions, ADEA should be disestablished. ADEA was created to support the efforts to transform the 9th Infantry Division into a High Technology Light Division. Since the 9th Division will become a one-of-a-kind motorized division, there is no justification for continuing ADEA. The committee has therefore denied all funding for ADEA. Those programs started by ADEA which have potential for future Army application should be transferred to normal R&D channels; others should be brought to an orderly conclusion.

The committee does, however, feel that there is merit to involving division, brigade and battalion commanders in the R&D process. The committee has, therefore, reallocated some of the ADEA funds to encourage development initiatives in support of combat forces and that effort is discussed in more detail later in this report.

U.S. ARMY LIGHT FORCES INITIATIVE

The Army plans to activate a 17th infantry division. This division is to be structured as a new light infantry division, composed of approximately 10,000 troops, with a relatively high combat to support ratio. Current planning guidelines envision that this new light division could be delivered to any place on the globe within 4 days by 500 C–141 aircraft sorties.

The committee strongly approves the concept of a rapidly deployable light division and endorses the Army's plans to establish a 17th division. The committee is concerned, however, that because the Army is establishing this 17th division within existing manpower end strengths, it may be shortchanging already scarce support forces. The committee is also concerned that this new light infantry division creates the fifth generic light division within the Army.

The committee, therefore, requests the Army to conduct a study of its long-range plans for light forces, including its plans for manning and equipping these forces. This report will not be prejudicial to Army plans to establish a 17th division, though it will serve as the basis for reviewing future manning and equipment policies. This report should be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than February 1, 1985.

AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT

This program is related to Army R&D program, Test Measurement and Diagnostic Equipment Development (PE 63748) which is discussed elsewhere in this section of the report. The committee does not feel that this new start is justified.

INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS

The administration requested $21.563 million for advanced development of various infantry weapon systems and ammunition which the committee has approved. The committee directs that $500,000 of this funding be used to type classify the 7.62mm saboted light armor penetrating (SLAP) round.

COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT

Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends limiting the growth of this Army R&D program, which is designed to develop combat clothing, equipment and rations, to essentially the level that was appropriated for fiscal year 1984. The committee recommends $3.000 million be authorized compared to the fiscal year 1984 allocation of $2.257 million.

COMBAT VEHICLE ARMOR/ANTI-ARMOR

This R&D program has grown over 300 percent since fiscal year 1984 and such drastic growth is not well justified. Recognizing that field demonstration of new anti-armor rounds is desirable as soon as practical, the committee doubts that the Army can obligate the increased funding sought. The committee has reduced project D223 by $10 million.

DIVISION AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL (SHORAD C^2)

SHORAD C^2 is an ongoing R&D program with the objective of integrating short range air defense systems, radar data, and other data devices into a functional air defense system. The request for this program for fiscal year 1985 is $129.424 million, compared to $38.198 appropriated for fiscal year 1984. The Defense Department offered a reduction of $60.000 million in this program as a part of the President's deficit reduction effort. The House Armed Services Committee reduced the program by $113.900 million. The committee was advised that the Army has restructured this effort from a three division demonstration to a single division demonstration. The committee concurs in this restructuring and recommends an authorization of $49.424 for fiscal year 1985.

DRAGON WARHEAD UPGRADE

The Dragon missile is an infantry anti-armor missile system. Research and development is just beginning this year on a replacement for the Dragon system, but the Dragon will be in the force structure well into the 1990's.

The committee has been advised that the Dragon warhead can be upgraded at comparatively little cost to enhance the Dragon to successfully defeat the armor threat for the remainder of this decade. The committee has therefore recommended adding $9.8 million to perfect the development of this improved warhead and expects the Army to seek procurement funds in fiscal year 1986.

ELECTRIC POWER SOURCES

This Army program is designed to adopt commercial power generators to military needs with emphasis on reducing noise and heat signatures. $6.878 million was appropriated for this program in fiscal year 1984, and the committee feels that the $7 million authorized provides for some real growth. This is an area of research where the Army should not try to "reinvent" the generator, but depend on private enterprise for most of the development effort.

FORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

The committee supports the concept of involving tactical commanders in the R&D process. The original concept embodied in ADEA and the 9th Infantry Division was sound, but, as discussed earlier in this report, with the decision to convert the 9th Division to a one-of-a-kind motorized division, the justification for retaining ADEA is gone. The committee is also concerned that ADEA appears to have grown too large (ADEA total budget for fiscal year 1985 was nearly $200 million) to accomplish its originally intended purpose.

The committee has elected to create a new R&D initiative designed to shorten the current cumbersome R&D cycle and to involve Army commanders in thinking about new concepts, new doctrine and new materiel. Under this initiative division commanders, selected by the Army would be given discretionary funds to pursue development initiatives that have potential for high payoff. The concept would be to let the division commanders, in concert with their subordinate commanders, decide what the priority developments might be for their division based on doctrine, geographical area of responsibility, etc. The division commander might choose to pursue development of a particular item of equipment or test a doctrinal concept. This program would be subject to review and approval through channels and should be coordinated with ongoing R&D programs to insure there is no duplication of effort. The committee would expect this "seed money" to lead to better definition of system needed and earlier development of new systems. The committee expects that the divisions will accomplish this effort using available manpower resources and that once proposals are reasonably well defined they can be transitioned to the normal (R&D) community.

HUMAN FACTORS IN TRAINING AND OPERATION EFFECTIVENESS

The objective of this Army program is "to develop and evaluate methods to improve interfaces between soldiers and the complex weapons and equipment they operate and maintain." For fiscal year 1984 appropriations were $4.202 million, the request for fiscal year 1985 was $10.376 million. The committee has reduced the request by $5.000 million which still provides substantial real growth in the program. The committee feels that human engineering in the operation and training of a particular weapon system should be an integral part of the R&D of that system. The need for a separate "human engineering" R&D program, except to set criteria and standards for all systems to follow, is questioned.

JOINT ANTI-TACTICAL MISSILE

This program is a tri-service program with the Army as lead service, it is designed to develop a tactical defense against both cruise and ballistic missiles.

The committee concurs in the action of the House Armed Services Committee in reducing this program substantially. The failure of the Defense Department to better define and justify this program, as required by the conference report on last year's authorization act, leads the committee to believe that the program is not well founded. The committee has authorized $32.335 million which is sufficient to carry out the near term effort that has promise for immediate results.

The funds provided are primarily for modifications to the Patriot air defense system to provide defense against short-range missiles such as the SS21 and SS23. While the committee supports this effort, the committee is concerned that the program be limited to defense against short-range missiles and not be expanded to provide defense against strategic ballistic missiles in a manner that would violate the ABM treaty provisions limiting the development of defense against such missiles. The committee understands that this is fully consistent with the Army's announced intention for this program. The committee's detailed discussion with respect to the ABM treaty elsewhere in this report is applicable to this program.

JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS (JINTACCS)

The JINTACCS program was established by the JCS with the Army as executive agent. The objective of the program is to develop the technical compatibility and interoperability requirements for tactical command and control standards for all U.S. and allied forces. As part of the President's program to reduce the deficit the Army offered a reduction of $7.7 million in this program in which the committee concurs.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)

The administration requested $108.1 million for Army research and development of the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS). The JSTARS is a joint Army and Air Force program designed to develop an airborne engagement system to detect and track moving formations of enemy surface units and to guide accurate attacks against moving or fixed ground targets. The committee continues to strongly support the development of the standoff targeting capability envisioned for the JSTARS program. (See discussion of JSTARS in Air Force research and development section). Subsequent to the submission of the fiscal year 1985 budget request, the Army and Air Force reached an agreement in which a single aircraft type (an Air Force C-18) would be used by both Services to provide stand-off targeting information. The committee supports this cooperative approach.

The funds requested in the Army JSTARS program will be used to develop the JSTARS radar. The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $102.1 million, a reduction of $6.0 million from the Administration's request for Army research and development of JSTARS.

JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (JTACMS)

Since its inception the committee has supported the concept of JTACMS, a Corps deep-strike conventionally-armed missile system, which would have maximum commonality with an Air Force deep-strike air-to-surface missile. However, after 2 years, the Army and the Air Force have been unable to agree on requirements for JTACMS and the committee sees little hope that the services, left to themselves, can ever agree on requirements and proceed to development. Therefore, the committee has recommended funding the Army program as requested subject to compliance with a special provision which the committee has added to the bill. The provision simply directs the Army to proceed with a deep-strike missile system with a maximum range of 200 kilometers and a payload of 1,000 pounds. Other system characteristics are to be developed by the Army. The committee intends that the Army proceed with a competitive development using off-the-shelf technology to the extent possible with a view toward achieving the earliest possible deployment date. The committee expects the current T–16 (Patriot) and T–22 (Lance) missile systems may serve as a starting point for developing the Army JTACMS; however, the committee has not limited competiton to only these systems. The committee does not rule out the option of considering a cruise missile to meet the Army requirements; however, the committee has doubts about the utility of cruise missiles due to the time urgency of potential targets. The committee continues to place strong emphasis on the achievement of maximum commonality between the Army and Air Force JTACMS systems. Recognizing that the two services may choose different vehicles for valid operational reasons, the committee nevertheless expects that major components, such as guidance, data link, and warhead will be common to both systems.

MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

This Army R&D program is designed to develop methods to match personnel skills with Army job requirements. For fiscal year 1984 $9.825 million was appropriated for this program and for fiscal year 1985 $17.026 million was requested. The committee has allowed $12.026 million for fiscal year 1985 which represents substantial real growth in this program.

MISSILE/ROCKET COMPONENTS

This Army R&D effort involves the scaling up of new missile and air defense radar concepts and components. $30.119 million was requested for five projects, three of which are new starts. The committee recommends a reduction of $10 million and questions the funding levels for project D263, kinetic energy missile, and project D271, multi-role survivable radar, both of which appear ill-defined and of questionable necessity. The committee does not object to some limited funding for these projects to better define the programs.

SOLDIER SUPPORT/SURVIVABILITY

This Army R&D program focuses on feeding and clothing the soldier to meet his needs in combat. The committee feels that budgeted growth is excessive in this program and has reduced the program to $4.000 million, which compares to $3.446 million appropriated for fiscal year 1984.

STINGER

The administration requested $13.898 million to begin the development of a reprogrammable microprocessor (RMP) to be installed on the Stinger air defense missile to permit reprograming the seeker logic to counter future threats. The administration proposed a reduction of $8.900 million as part of the President's deficit cutting package. The committee concurs with the reduction recommended by the Department.

SUPPORT OF DEVELOPMENT TESTING/SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING/PROGRAM WIDE ACTIVITIES

These Army programs are Army R&D overhead accounts that pay for the operation of Army R&D ranges, installations and headquarters. Due to budgetary constraints, the committee has elected to hold these programs at essentially the fiscal year 1984 level allowing 5 percent for inflation.

SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE ROCKET SYSTEM

The program involves the development of a terminally guided warhead (TGW) for the Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS). This is a cooperative development effort with the British, French, and West Germans. The program will concentrate on the competitive development of a horizontally gliding submunition with a millimeter wave seeker. The committee supports this program as submitted.

The committee has been made aware that there is a near term option for a smart warhead for the MLRS that would use existing laser guidance technology. The committee feels that the potential pay off for a long range, laser guided warhead is great and has added $10 million for the development of such a warhead. The committee intends that this not be a new research effort; existing guidance and laser designator technology is to be adapted to the MLRS rocket. The committee would expect such a warhead to be successfully demonstrated in less than 2 years at which time a production decision could be made.

TEST MEASUREMENT AND DIAGNOSTIC EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT

The administration requested $4.767 million for three R&D projects "to enhance (the) testability, self-diagnostic ability, and operational availability" of Army weapons systems. This program is related to the Automated Test Support System which the Congress denied in fiscal year 1984. It is also related to another Army engineering development program (PE 64746A) Automatic Test Equipment Development which is discussed elsewhere in this report. The committee still does not understand the justification for this program. The weapon system developer is paid to produce automated test equipment for his particular system. From all reports available to the committee, new systems being fielded do come with automated test equipment that is performing properly. The justification for this program is not adequate and the committee has denied the funding requested.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

[Dollars in thousands]

Line number		Fiscal year 1985 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
	Technology base	($828,172)	(−$9,750)	($818,422)
10	U/S target surv tech	45,690	−6,000	39,690
11	Surf/aerospace target surveillance	36,387	−1,750	34,637
15	Human factors and simulation tech	7,967	−1,000	6,967
21	Personnel and training tech	6,456	−1,000	5,456
	Advanced technology development	(286,399)	(−46,350)	(240,049)
27	Environmental application	8,287	−2,000	6,287
30	Advance aircraft subsystems	6,780	−1,000	5,780
35	Ship prop system (Adv)	47,703	−4,000	43,703
38	Conventional munitions	14,323	−4,000	10,323
39	Joint Service EOD development	7,979	−1,000	6,979
41	Oceanog instrumentation	5,867	−2,500	3,367
42	Medical development	12,785	−2,000	10,785
43	Manpower control system	5,020	−2,500	2,520
44	Advance marine biological	5,186	−500	4,686
45	Ocean eng tech dev	18,876	−2,000	16,876
46	Education and training	5,008	−1,500	3,508
47	Environmental prot	10,517	−2,500	8,017
49	Adv tech for logistics	7,950	−7,950	0
54	Manufacturing tech	68,499	−17,900	50,599
—	Lighter than air technology	0	+5,000	5,000
	Strategic programs	(2,380,055)	(−33,367)	(2,346,688)
57	Trident II	2,091,113	−5,000	2,086,113
58	Strategic technical support	8,708	−2,300	6,408
59	FBM system	40,391	−5,000	35,391
60	SSBN security	48,862	−5,000	43,862
61	Trident I	41,199	−11,200	30,000
63	Navy strategic communications	106,535	+10,000	116,535
66	WIS modernization	14,867	−14,867	0
	Tactical programs	(5,223,531)	(−293,221)	(4,930,310)
67	Airborne electronic warfare equipment	67,335	−3,000	64,335
68	VTX–TS	113,420	−45,000	68,420
74	CV ASW module	5,289	−1,000	4,289
75	Air ASW	2,384	−2,384	0
77	A–6E improvement	19,633	+50,000	69,633
80	Tactical air reconnaissance	13,277	−3,100	10,277
81	Aircraft survivability and vulnerability	29,493	−7,000	22,493
85	Adv surface/air missile (ASAM)	9,040	−5,000	4,040
86	Submarine ASW SOW	61,659	−20,000	41,659
88	BGAAWC	12,991	−3,000	9,991
90	Surface MCM	30,276	−1,000	29,276
92	Sub sonar devel (Adv)	31,252	−9,908	21,344
97	Shipboard damage control	20,419	−2,000	18,419
110	Link Dogwood	22,753	−3,000	19,753
111	Surface ASW	20,863	−3,000	17,863
116	Surf ship navig system	2,959	−2,959	0
117	Amphib assault craft	4,571	−4,571	0
118	Attack submarine development	24,121	−2,000	22,121
125	DDG–51	124,585	−10,000	114,585

Line number		Fiscal year 1985 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
126	Joint advanced systems	137,009	−4,000	133,009
127	Mine development (advanced)	0	+1,000	1,000
129	Marine corps assault vehicle	54,553	−12,000	42,553
135	Anti-sub warfare sign	9,381	−9,381	0
137	Command and control	27,384	−12,500	14,884
140	Facilities improvement	10,477	−1,500	8,977
150	LRAP	10,576	−2,000	8,576
152	RDSS	11,766	−1,000	10,766
153	Avionics development	15,033	−3,000	12,033
156	Helicopter development	16,518	−2,000	14,518
157	AV–8B (engineering)	70,447	−10,400	60,047
158	Support equipment	21,206	−4,000	17,206
161	Airborne ASW development	24,346	−4,000	20,346
162	Aircraft IR signature suppression	9,290	−3,000	6,290
163	P–3 modernization	37,388	−15,000	22,388
164	ABN electronic warfare engineering	49,442	−4,000	45,442
168	CV ASW Helo	44,516	−19,500	25,016
172	Acoustic search sensors (Eng)	31,240	−10,000	21,240
177	AWG–9 update	7,926	−7,926	0
178	Aircraft engine component improvement program	90,011	−1,000	89,011
179	MK–92 FCS upgrade	19,295	+20,000	39,295
182	CG–47 product improvement	55,593	−6,000	49,593
183	Link Ash	19,729	−2,500	16,229
184	AMRAAM	35,585	−15,000	20,585
192	SM–2 (N)	25,679	25,679	0
194	Tomahawk	81,501	−6,400	75,101
198	New threat upgrade	51,783	−3,000	48,783
205	Communications system	7,991	−1,000	6,991
217	Ship development (Eng)	101,275	−5,000	96,275
219	Shipboard EW improvement	49,819	−5,000	44,819
224	Mine development (Eng)	18,841	−5,000	13,841
229	Bomb fuze improvement	6,852	−1,000	5,852
233	MC assault vehicle	11,935	−2,500	9,435
237	Chalk Banyam	10,657	−2,000	8,657
239	Command and control (Eng)	53,558	−3,000	50,558
242	Surface warfare training	31,834	−5,000	26,834
246	Command/Control/Communication System	32,771	−3,000	29,771
248	Regional tactical surveillance	63,666	−24,662	39,004
251	JINTACCS	16,263	−4,500	11,763
254	Fleet Tac D&E	16,353	−1,500	14,853
260	F/A–18 squadrons	19,798	+15,000	34,798
261	Early warning aircraft squadrons	39,149	−3,000	36,149
263	Fleet telecom (Tac)	75,346	−5,000	70,346
267	Underseas surveillance	29,725	−1,500	28,225
268	SURTASS	5,751	−5,751	0
271	Electronic warfare	14,254	−1,000	13,254
272	Counter C ^{3} development	30,189	−2,000	28,189
274	JTIDS	141,699	−5,000	136.699
284	F–14A	293,975	−15,000	278,975
286	Electronic warfare counter-response	44,111	−4,000	−40,111
—	Marine low-cost FLIR	0	+12,000	12,000
—	Penguin missile	0	+14,600	14,600
—	Joint service rotary engine	0	+6,000	6,000
—	T–700 Engine	0	+17,000	17,000
—	Undistributed reduction, Marine Corps program	0	−10,700	−10,700
	Intelligence and communications	(421,535)	(.........)	(421,535)
	Defensewide mission support	(686,384)	(−29,032)	(657,352)
309	Range instrumentation and system development	20,273	−2,000	18,273
310	Target systems development	84,197	−2,000	82,197
311	Training and Pers Sup Dev	5,636	−1,000	4,636
324	RDT&E lab and facilities management	64,569	−14,500	50,069
326	RDT&E ship and aircraft	84,737	−6,000	78,737
330	Productivity improvement	3,532	−3,532	0
	Undistributed reduction	—	−27,248	−27,248
	Total, RDT&E, Navy	9,826,076	−438,968	9,387,108

A-6E IMPROVEMENTS

The administration requested $19.6 million to upgrade the Navy's A-6E medium attack aircraft.

Following the submission of the fiscal year 1985 budget, the Department of Defense decided to initiate a major modernization program for the A-6E. This program would address deficiencies in the A-6E airframe, propulsion and avionics equipment in an effort to enhance the performance, reliability, maintainability and survivability of the aircraft in the 1990's.

Although the committee has twice recommended suspending production of the A-6E (fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984), it nevertheless supports the A-6E modernization effort. There are currently more than 340 A-6E's in the Navy and Marine Corps inventory, many of which will be flying well into the next decade. These aircraft are becoming increasingly less survivable as the threat advances, and they represent a growing maintenance burden. The A-6E currently requires between 55-60 direct maintenance man hours per flight hour (DMMH)—the Navy's newest aircraft, the F/A-18, requires between 20-25 DMMH.

The committee has repeatedly encouraged the services to consider product improvements to the existing weapon systems rather than embarking on expensive new development programs to meet evolving requirements. Therefore, in view of the considerable service life remaining in the current fleet of A-6E's, the committee supports the Navy's decision to enhance the survivability, maintainability and reliability of these aircraft.

However, the committee is concerned that the Navy's focus in this effort has been almost exclusively on new production aircraft. The extent and cost of retrofitting the proposed improvements into existing aircraft were apparently not part of the negotiations recently conducted between the Navy and the A-6E manufacturer. This is a matter of some concern since at the current production rate of 6 aircraft per year, it will take 26 years to modernize 13 carrier air wings. Retrofitting these improvements into late model aircraft would permit the Navy to introduce the upgraded A-6E in much larger numbers and much sooner than could be done if relying strictly on new production aircraft.

The committee is also concerned that the projected cost of the upgrade program, in excess of $500 million for development alone, may not be justified. This investment, amortized over the projected production run of 150-200 aircraft, will add approximately $3.0 million to the cost of each aircraft. Another $3.0 million will be added per aircraft in procurement, for a total additional cost of $6.0 million each. This will make what is already an expensive aircraft ($37.6 million each in fiscal year 1985 including non-recurring costs and all support equipment) even more expensive. Obviously the unit cost is a function of the production rate and could be reduced substantially if the Navy were willing to commit the necessary resources. Reducing the production rates of other aircraft, such as the F/A-18, would simply transfer the burden of inefficiency and will not be regarded an acceptable source of funds.

The Navy has estimated that an additional $100.0 million is required to initiate the comprehensive A-6E upgrade program in fiscal year 1985. The committee recommends authorization of $69.6 million, consisting of $19.6 million in the administration's request and an additional authorization of $50.0 million. The committee expects the initial expenditures in this program to be directed at improving the A-6E's survivability, maintainability and reliability rather than concentrating on expanding the capabilities of the aircraft.

The committee notes that the House Armed Services Committee has also expressed concerns about the Navy's plans to upgrade the A-6E and has directed the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the House and Senate Armed Services committees by February 1, 1985 detailing those plans. The Secretary of the Navy is further directed to respond in that report to the issues raised herein, particularly the justification of the cost of program, the extent and cost of retrofitting, and the ability of the Navy to fund the program without simply drawing off funds from other Navy aircraft programs.

ADVANCED SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE

The administration requested $9.040 million for the Navy's Advanced Surface-to-Air Missile (ASAM). The budget revision submitted in May reduced the request for ASAM by $5.0 million.

ASAM is the program to develop a successor to the SM-2 Block II missile. The candidates for this program were once called the SM-2 Block III and the SM-3 and were funded under the Standard Missile Improvements program. Also, the ASAM program element last year carried the title "Army/Navy Surface-to-Air Missile Technology."

The Navy has completed its Outer Air Battle study, and has proven its requirement for a longer range missile. Intelligence estimates tend to support the decision to begin the ASAM program at this time.

The committee recommends $4.040 million for the ASAM program.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY FOR LOGISTICS INFORMATION

The administration requested $7.950 million for the Advanced Technology for Logistics Information program. This program element was formerly called Naval Technical Information Presentation System.

The Navy, as do many civilian corporations, must maintain technical information for the maintenance and repair of equipment. However, it is not evident how this program will alleviate the Navy's concerns in a timely manner; nor is it clear why this technology cannot be developed by and acquired from commercial sources.

The committee recommends no funds be authorized for the Advanced Technology for Logistics Information program.

AIR ASW

The administration requested funds for several anti-submarine warfare programs involving aircraft, including:

$2.384 million for Air ASW.
$9.381 million for ASW signal processing.
$10.576 million for Long Range Acoustic Propagation.
$11.766 million for Rapidly Deployable Surveillance Systems.
$24.346 million for Airborne ASW Development.
$37.388 million for P–3 modernization.
$31.240 million for Acoustic Search Sensors (engineering).

The committee is concerned that the Navy is not providing adequate management or support for the air ASW mission.

Manifestations of this problem include: (1) the fact that sonobuoy procurement was specifically targeted for reduction in the DOD May budget revision; (2) the failure to introduce new detection equipment into general fleet operation at a pace commensurate with Soviet submarine developments; and (3) the failure to seize control of projected software development and ownership costs for air ASW equipment.

The committee also notes that some 2 years after beginning development of the UYS–2, which is the successor to the UYS–1, the Navy placed a notice in Commerce Business Daily (March 21, 1984) requesting "evaluation of the UYS–1 Advanced Signal Processor (ASP) with respect to the potential technical usage and improvement within anticipated advances in the state-of-the-art of computer signal processing." This notice, together with Navy's plans to increase program store addressability in the UYS–1, indicates that the air ASW program management is not well coordinated with related Navy programs, and also that the Air ASW program does not receive adequate attention from senior naval leadership.

The committee recommends authorization of no funds for Air ASW, a reduction of $2.384 million; $22.388 million for P–3 modernization, a reduction of $15 million: no funds for ASW signal processing, a reduction of $9.381 million; $8.576 million for Long Range Acoustic Propagation, a reduction of $2 million; $10.766 million for Rapidly Deployable Surveillance Systems, a reduction of $1 million; $20.346 million for Airborne ASW Development, a reduction of $4 million; and $21.240 million for Acoustic Search Sensors (engineering), a reduction of $10 million. The reductions total $43.765 million.

AIRCRAFT CARRIER ASW HELICOPTER

The administration requested $44.516 million for the CV ASW helicopter program.

The CV ASW helicopter program will develop a replacement for the SH–3 anti-submarine warfare helicopters currently deployed on aircraft carriers. The existing SH–3s are scheduled to begin retirement in a few years because of safety and maintenance requirements, and the production line is no longer open.

The distinguishing characteristic of a carrier-based ASW helicopter is its dipping sonar, which can be lowered into the water for the detection of submarines.

Last year, the Congress provided funds for the SH-60 CV Variant helicopter program. The Navy had informed congressional committees that it intended to use a variation of the SH-60B (the LAMPS MK-III helicopter), fitted with a dipping sonar, as a replacement for the SH-3. The program called for using an existing helicopter, stripping it of unnecessary electronic gear, installing an existing AN/AQS-13 sonar with minor modifications, and developing a simple hover control system for use with the dipping sonar. The basic funding profile called for $20 million in fiscal year 1984, $30 million in fiscal year 1985, and $5 million in fiscal year 1986; a total of $55 million. This was a reduction from the 4-year, $75 million proposal originally submitted by the Navy with the fiscal year 1984 budget.

Between the time when the fiscal year 1984 budget was funded and the submission of the fiscal year 1985 budget, the Office of the Secretary of Defense directed the Navy to compete not just the avionics, as the Navy intended, but also the airframe. The primary alternative proposed by OSD was the SH-2 (LAMPS MK-I helicopter) equipped with the T-700 engine. The budget request for fiscal year 1985 was increased to $44.516 million, and a date for completion of the R&D program was not defined.

Even with the T-700 engine modification, significant differences between the SH-2 and the SH-60 helicopters remain: range, payload, and endurance. The SH-2 would be unable to remain airborne even as long as the SH-3 without refueling, and this would impose unacceptable restrictions on carrier flight deck operations. Helicopter in-flight refueling from surface escort ships is unsatisfactory because it could require breaking contact with submarine targets during peacetime and requires a time-consuming, expensive hover operation while the helicopter pilot personally inspects a fuel sample hoisted aloft before refueling, and because of the reduced fuel pressures from hoses raised above a flight deck. In addition, the SH-2 cannot carry two torpedoes to as great a range or for as long as the SH-60. The Navy specifies multiple weapons because of the difficult requirements of anti-submarine warfare.

The committee fully supports the Navy's requirements for local ASW capability and, specifically, for Naval helicopters equipped with dipping sonars. Moreover, the committee recognizes the Navy's endurance, range and payload requirements for ASW helicopters are dictated by developments in Soviet submarine speed, noise reduction, and weapons and by the demands of battle group commanders responsible for the safety and combat capability of their forces. The committee also recognizes the need for competition in any program, but remains concerned that competition in the CV ASW helicopter program is being used to unnecessarily delay a decision to proceed with full scale engineering development.

Consequently, the committee authorizes $25.016 million for the CV ASW helicopter program, a reduction of $19.5 million. The committee also directs that the contract for full scale engineering development of CV ASW helicopters be signed no later than November 30, 1984. Moreover, no more than 20% of the funds authorized for the Undersea Target Surveillance program may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense informs the committee that the contract for full scale engineering development of the CV ASW helicopter has been signed.

AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT CRAFT

The administration initially requested $4.571 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of amphibious assault craft. In the revised budget, the administration deleted this request. The justification for this revision was termination of testing of improvements to and alternate uses for air cushion craft.

This program would continue efforts to provide product improvement engineering, tests, and trial support for the Landing Craft, Air Cushion.

The committee recommends no authorization in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of amphibious assault craft.

AMRAAM

The administration requested $35.6 million for Navy research and development of the advanced medium range air-to-air missile (AMRAAM). The AMRAAM is being developed (principally by the Air Force) to replace the AIM-7 Sparrow missile in the Navy and Air Force inventories.

The AMRAAM has undergone a three month slip in the full scale development program and is likely to be delayed at least three additional months.

The committee recommends an authorization of $20.6 million for Navy research and development of AMRAAM. This is a reduction of $15.0 million from the administration's request.

AWG-9 UPDATE

The administration requested $7.9 million for the integration of a programmable signal processor (PSP) in the F-14 AWG-9 weapons control system. This would convert the system from the current analog technology to high speed, programmable, digital signal processing techonoly substantially increasing the capability, reliability, and maintainability of the system.

Subsequent to the submission of the administration's fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization request, the committee learned that the Navy now intends to conduct this effort under the comprehensive F-14 upgrade program.

The committee strongly supports the Navy's plan to install a programmable signal processor in the F-14. However, since this effort will be funded under another program element, F-14A, the committee recommends that no funds be authorized under the AWG-9 Update program element.

CG-47 PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT

The administration requested $55.593 million for CG-47 product improvement. The revised budget request included $50.593 million, a reduction of $5.0 million.

This program funds improvements to the SPY-1 radar and associated combat system.

The committee supports funding a continuing program to improve the CG-47 class guided missile cruisers, which are just entering fleet operation and which will continue to receive new equipment, such as the Vertical Launch System and the SQS-53C sonar, which must be integrated with the Aegis combat system. However, the committee regards this as a "level of effort" program, and does not support continuing growth for this program, as forecast. The committee notes that no milestones or other means of measuring achievements appear to have been established.

The committee recommends authorization of $49.593 million, a reduction of $6.0 million.

CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSIS PROFESSIONAL STAFF CEILING

Prior to 1976 the professional staff ceiling for the Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) was frozen at a figure of 159 man-years. CNA is one of several institutions doing research for the various branches of the Department of Defense that are categorized as Federal Contract Research Centers (FCRCs).

In 1976 the Department of Defense outlined different procedures for establishing the same type of ceilings at two other institutions, Mitre and Aerospace Corporations. That procedure allowed the ceiling to vary based on the workload (e.g., the budget) of the organization, using 1976 as the base year and averaging in the budgets of the two previous years. This procedure establishes a new ceiling limit each year but restrains unbridled growth by establishing a firm base year and forcing the institution to include the ceilings of more than the budget year in its calculations.

For any given year (X), the professional staff ceiling would be determined as follows:

CF(X) = Ceiling Factor for year X
RDT&E,N(X) = Navy RDT&E Budget for year X
Prop RDT&E,N(X) = Proposed Navy RDT&E Budget for year X
CF(X) = ⅓ (Prop RDT&E,N(X)/RDT&E,N(FY76) + Prop RDT&E,N(X−1)/RDT&E,N(FY76) + Prop RDT&E,N(X−2)/RDT&E,N(FY76))
CNA Ceiling (year X) = (CNA ceiling (FY1976)) (CF(X))

The committee believes that Congress should be concerned with controlling the budgets of the various research institutions that report to the Department of Defense, and that to be overly concerned with the specific manning levels of these institutions on a year-to-year basis is a degree of congressional management oversight that is unwarranted and unnecessary.

The committee authorizes the Department of the Navy to utilize the formula outlined above to determine the professional staff ceiling at the Center for Naval Analysis

CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS

The administration originally requested $14.323 million for the Conventional Munitions program, which develops advanced explosives and fuzing devices. The revised budget request included $12.323 million, a reduction of $2.0 million.

This program has grown significantly since the previous year, when it was funded at a level of $4.173 million, and the increase is not adequately justified.

The committee recommends authorization of $10.323 million, a reduction of $4.0 million. The reduction is made without prejudice.

DDG-51

The administration requested $124.585 million for the DDG-51 program. These funds are planned only to improve the DDG-51 combat system.

Based on information provided by the Navy, no major milestones are envisaged for the program, and it appears now to have become a "level of effort" program.

The committee recommends authorization of $114.585 million, a reduction of $10 million. The reduction is without prejudice.

EXTREMELY LOW FREQUENCY (ELF)

Extremely Low Frequency (ELF) communications will provide a capability to maintain continuous broadcast contact with submarines at operational depths. The Extremely Low Frequency communications system will provide a unique capability by freeing the submarine from the vulnerabilities and limitations of near-surface operations. The program consists of full-scale development of antennas, transmitters and submarine receivers. There will be two transmitter sites: one is to be constructed in Michigan; the other site, already in existence, is in Wisconsin.

The program has recently been disrupted by a court ruling that prohibits the start of construction of the Michigan site. The ruling also precludes further installation of receiver equipment on submarines.

The committee believes that there are direct and compelling reasons to maintain depths in SSBN operations in the interest of continued high survivability. The committee, therefore, strongly supports the earliest availability of the ELF capability, and recommends authorization of $26.4 million in research and development and $6.0 million in procurement fundings as requested by the administration.

F/A-18 SQUADRONS

The administration requested $19.8 million for the evaluation of suggested improvements or modifications to correct fleet reported deficiencies in the F/A-18 Hornet. The committee strongly supports these efforts.

For the past 2 years the committee has recommended replacing Marine Corps A-6E Intruders with two-seat F/A-18 Hornets. The Marine A-6E's (with a median retirement date of 1997) would be transferred to the Navy, thereby relieving the Marine Corps of the maintenance, training, and logistics burden associated with operating a relatively small number (5 squadrons of 10 aircraft each plus a Replacement Training Squadron) of all-weather, medium attack

A-6E's. To replace these aircraft in the Marine inventory the committee has supported the development of a limited all-weather attack capability for the F/A-18.

If successful, this effort would lead to a Marine Corps tactical, fixed wing inventory of F/A-18's, AV-8B's and EA-6B's instead of the current assortment of F-4's, F/A-18's, AV-8A's, A-6E's, A-4M's and EA-6B's.

The cost estimates to develop this capability range from $40.0 million to $230.0 million (an earlier estimate which included substantial airframe modifications exceeded $500.0 million). Prior to obligating funds for this effort the Navy is directed to provide the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services a report detailing the projected cost, scope and schedule of the program.

It is not intended that the all-weather capability developed for the F/A-18 be equivalent to that of the A-6E. Rather, the committee envisions an austere program designed to meet minimum Marine Corps requirements.

The Navy is also encouraged to consider providing this added capability to single-piloted Navy F/A-18's. Such a decision would bring strong competitive pressures to bear on the balance struck in future airwings between F/A-18's and A-6E's, thereby ensuring the Navy a very favorable negotiating position for the procurement of both aircraft.

The committee recommends an authorization of $34.8 million for Navy F/A-18 squadrons, of which $15.0 million is for the development of an austere all-weather attack capability.

JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) DEVELOPMENT (ADVANCED)

The administration initially requested $7.979 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Joint Service EOD Development (Advanced). In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $6.979 million. No specific justification for this revision was presented.

The mission of EOD units is detection, identification, rendering safe, recovery, field and laboratory evaluation, and final disposal of unexploded nuclear, conventional, chemical, and biological munitions. This research and development program provides for development of EOD tools and equipment for use by all military Services.

The committee recommends authorization of $6.979 million in fiscal year 1985 for Joint Service EOD Development (Advanced).

JOINT SERVICE ROTARY ENGINE DEVELOPMENT

The administration did not request authorization in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of the rotary engine.

The Marine Corps' program to develop a rotary engine for assault vehicles, particularly the Landing Vehicle Tracked (Experimental), was terminated in fiscal year 1983. This termination resulted from concerns about the complex technology of the rotary engine and the possible negative implications of that technology for future reliability, maintainability, logistics, and readiness.

During February 1984, Deere and Company, one of the world's foremost manufacturers of diesel engines, purchased all U.S. rotary engine assets. This development along with the potential effectiveness of the rotary engine in a series of future systems favors a renewed development effort. In recent correspondence, the Marine Corps has stated: "The Marine Corps sees the rotary engine as a very attractive technology that could offer certain advantages over existing diesel and turbine engines. The compactness, low weight, multi-fuel capability and simplicity of the rotary engine are some of the potential advantages that prompted the Marine Corps to consider it as a power source . . ."

While the rotary engine appears to have numerous, effective applications in future military systems, the committee remains concerned about the possible negative implications of that technology. Therefore, while the committee supports the initiation of research and development of the rotary engine, the Department of Defense should carefully and continually assess the advantages and disadvantages of military applications. Moreover, the Department of Defense should take full advantage of rotary engine research in the private sector and other Government agencies.

The committee proposes that the Navy direct this program as a joint Service effort and, in view of the multi-Service aspect of future military applications of the rotary engine, coordinate this R&D effort with other military Services and government agencies.

The committee recommends authorization of $6.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Joint Service Rotary Engine Development.

JTIDS

The administration requested $141.699 million for the JTIDS program (Joint Tactical Information Distribution System). This program is developing significantly improved tactical communication devices.

The committee is concerned that the Link 11 improvement project receives insufficient attention and support within the JTIDS program. Accordingly, the committee directs that no funds may be reprogramed from the Link 11 improvement project into the larger JTIDS project. The committee has similar concerns for the C2 processor project.

The committee recommends authorization of $136.699 million for JTIDS, a reduction of $5 million. The reduction is made without prejudice against the program.

JVX

The administration requested $198.5 million for the development of a tilt rotor, vertical take off and landing (VTOL) aircraft. The JVX is intended to meet the amphibious/vertical assault needs of the Marine Corps, the combat search and rescue (SAR) requirements of the Navy, and the special operations needs of the Air Force. Once developed, the JVX may also be procured by the Army to meet medium lift requirements. The JVX will replace the CH-46 and CH-53A/D in the Marine Corps, the HH-3A in the Navy, and will supplement the HH-53, HH-60, and C-130 aircraft in the Air

Force. In addition to these military applications, the committee anticipates considerable commercial interest in the aircraft.

The committee recommends an authorization of $198.5 million for the development of the JVX.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR TECHNOLOGY

Navy studies during the past decade show evidence that long-endurance, lighter-than-air vessels equipped with surveillance radars can improve the performance of Navy combatants. Their primary advantage is their tremendous endurance at low rates of fuel consumption, and they could be deployed near selected naval facilities or with surface action groups.

The growing threats to U.S. naval surface forces, demands for greater force distribution, and the availability of improved materials and airborne sensors provide a basis for the emergence of the airship as a cost-effective option to enhance naval battle forces. The Navy should explore the potential benefits of ligher-than-air technology through the development of a prototype surveillance airship which may also be useful to the other services.

The committee recommends authorization of $5.0 million for engineering designs and analysis that can serve as a basis for creating a prototype airship to demonstrate the military value of such use for surveillance and targeting in support of naval missions.

MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

The administration originally requested $68.499 million for the Manufacturing Technology program. The revised budget request included $50.599 million, a reduction of $17.9 million.

This program funds the development of advanced manufacturing technologies to reduce acquisition and support costs for military equipment and to reduce dependence on the import of strategic and critical materials. Major areas of emphasis include improved welding, composites manufacturing, robotic applications, and high speed electronic packaging.

The committee encourages the Navy to continue its new support for improved ship manufacturing techniques and also its emphasis on advanced composites manufacturing.

The committee recommends authorization of $50.599 million, a reduction of $17.9 million. The reduction is without prejudice. The committee directs that all funds for the Manufacturing Technology program shall be considered minimum levels, not subject to reduction in any manner.

MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES (63611M)

The administration initially requested $54.553 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Marine Corps Assault Vehicles under Program Element 63611M. This initial request would provide funds for three research and development programs: Landing Vehicle Track (Experimental) (LVT(X)), Light Armored Vehicle (LAV), and Mobile Protected Gun System (MPGS).

In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $42.553 million. The justification for this revision was a decision to significantly delay the development of the MPGS. The MPGS was a joint Marine Corps/Army effort. The decision to delay the Marine Corps effort was influenced by the Army's failure to request funds in fiscal year 1985 for its portion of the joint development effort.

This research and development program provides funds to design, develop, and test selected wheeled and tracked vehicles and engines which will meet the firepower and mobility requirements for amphibious operations and subsequent operations ashore in the 1980s and 1990s.

The committee recommends authorization of $42.553 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Marine Corps Assault Vehicles (63611M)

MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES (64656M)

The administration requested $11.935 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Marine Corps Assault Vehicles under Program Element 64656M.

This research and development program will provide for integration and testing of the command and control variant and evaluation of the air defense variant of the Light Armored Vehicle.

The committee recommends authorization of $9.435 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Marine Corps Assault Vehicles (64656M).

MARK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE

The administration requested $19.295 million for the Mark 92 Fire Control System Upgrade program, of which $4.354 million was designated for the Phase III upgrade. In the budget revision submitted in May, funds for the Phase III program were deleted.

Phase III would develop a fixed, four-faced, phased array radar system. At a hearing held by the committee this year, unclassified testimony was submitted which indicated that the Phase III radar would have significantly improved performance in an electronic countermeasures (jamming) environment. The Navy's position, however, was that the system would be too expensive to install on frigates now under construction relative to the Navy's other modernization priorities, that improvement of the ECM portion of the radar was not a high priority given the mission of this class of ships, and that the improved performance does, therefore, not justify the expense.

The committee does feel that the Navy should be doing more research into the design of smaller, lighter weight, fixed, phased array radars for there are a large number of warships in the fleet that could benefit from the addition of a capable anti-air system. Indeed, in testimony the Navy has mentioned the possibility of upgrading not only the FFG-7s, but the *Spruance* class of ASW destroyers. Moreover, such a system will be needed in new classes of small frigates and other patrol combatants.

The committee also agrees that the degree of concurrency and cost required to install the Phase III on the frigate authorized in the fiscal year 1984 budget may not be justified and recommends that the Secretary of the Navy determine the configuration of the FFG-7 authorized for appropriation in the Department of Defense

Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98–94). The committee also believes that the research into the Phase III radar authorized in prior year funding should not be delayed any longer. Such action is not responsive to the validated military requirements of the Navy to examine smaller phased array radars for other than first line AAW ships.

Consequently the committee recommends authorization of $39.295 million for the MK–92 Fire Control System Upgrade program, an increase of $20.0 million. The committee also directs that the funds authorized within this Act and in prior years be utilized to proceed with the examination of the capabilities of the fixed, phased-array radar, including the construction of a land-based test site, as requested.

MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY

The administration requested $35.960 million for the Navy's Materials Technology program, which funds the development of new materials which may have application to advanced aircraft, ships, missiles and other structures.

The committee strongly supports exploratory research and development of new materials, especially in areas related to advanced metal matrix composites, carbon-carbon composites and oxidation resistant carbon-carbon composites. The committee recognizes the importance of near term application of these materials to improve combat survivability, reduce weight and cost, and improve performance.

The committee authorizes $35.960 million for the Materials Technology program. Of the total funding provided, $10 million is available only for the missile materials project, including $5.0 million for metal matrix composites and $5.0 million for carbon-carbon composites.

MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT (ADVANCED)

The administration requested $12.785 million for the Medical Development (Advanced) program. The budget revision recommended $10.785 million.

One of the projects funded within this program is the Navy Biodynamics Laboratory (NBDL). The laboratory's basic functions include development of improved techniques and standards for measuring ejection seat performance and human limitations during rapid accelerations; development of improved techniques for measuring performance degradation and reducing the effects of motion sickness, which is particularly important for the combat effectiveness of smaller, minimally-manned, surface combatants; and providing a source of expertise for systems commands within the Navy and the Air Force developing new equipment, including ejection seats for advanced fighter aircraft.

One of the goals of the NBDL is to design an improved mannikan which promises to permit the elimination of 20 billets currently filled by human test volunteers. The committee encourages the Navy to continue with this program, despite the budget reductions which are necessitated by the congressional budget resolution.

The committee recommends authorization of $10.785 million, which is a reduction of $2 million. The reduction is without prejudice.

MINE DEVELOPMENT (ADVANCED)

The administration requested no funds for the Mine Development (advanced) program in fiscal year 1985. Moreover, the administration also indicates that no funds will be requested for this program in fiscal year 1986.

The committee is concerned that the Navy's only program for funding advanced development of mines is not receiving adequate attention and support.

The committee recommends authorization of $1 million for the Mine Development (advanced) program.

NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE

The administration initially requested $9.224 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Naval Special Warfare. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $8.224 million. No justification for this revision was presented.

This program develops weapons, life-support, and delivery systems for Naval Special Forces, SEAL Teams, SEAL Delivery Vehicle Teams, Special Boat Units, and Explosive Ordnance Disposal units in support of their missions which include unconventional warfare and ordnance disposal. The committee is aware that the Fleet Commanders have placed increased emphasis on special warfare capabilities after analyzing the British use of commando teams in the Falklands.

The committee recommends authorization of $9.224 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of Naval Special Warfare, the amount initially requested by the administration.

NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS

The administration originally requested $106.535 million for the development of reliable, survivable and secure communications from the National Command Authorities and Commanders-in-Chief to deployed fleet ballistic missile submarine forces. $77.105 million of the requested amount was for the ECX (E-6A), a modern jet aircraft intended to replace the currently deployed C-130 TACAMO aircraft. No procurement funds were requested, although plans approved last year, including advanced procurement funding, anticipated E-6A aircraft procurement in the fiscal year 1985 request.

The administration recommended cancellation of the E-6A program in the amended budget request. Subsequently, the committee was advised that the Department had reconsidered the E-6A issue and had decided to continue the E-6A program in fiscal year 1985 because it would offer greater mission flexibility in the near term, and would have the potential for greater system growth in the long term.

The record has been consistent and compelling with regard to the E-6A as the preferred aircraft to replace the existing TACAMO force. The committee has strongly supported the program on the basis of those arguments, and because of the strongly held belief that the SLBM force can be a no more effective or survivable as a deterrent force than the communication system that supports it.

Notwithstanding this prior and continuing support, the committee is concerned about the affordability of the E-6A given the budget pressures that motivated the Navy to reevaluate aircraft options to perform the TACAMO mission. The committee, therefore, recommends authorization of $77.1 million for research and development of the E-6A, but directs that no fiscal year 1985 funds be expended for this purpose until the committee has received a report from the Secretary of Defense that: (1) certifies the Department's commitment to E-6A procurement in the Five Year Defense Plan; and (2), provides an update of the TACAMO Alternatives Study submitted in response to language in the fiscal year 1982 Defense Authorization Report. This update should address the most recent connectivity, survivability and other considerations, including possible future communications developments, that bear on the choice of aircraft to provide assured SSBN communications into the next decade.

The committee further directs the Navy to undertake a competitive procurement for the integration of mission-related communication equipments on the E-6A aircraft.

The committee recommends authorization of $10 million over the amount requested to accelerate the very low frequency (VLF) upgrade for the TACAMO mission. This upgrade will greatly enhance the ability of TACAMO aircraft, either C-130 or E-6A, to downlink the Emergency Action Message to Trident SSBNs deployed in the Pacific.

NEW DESIGN SUBMARINE

The administration requested $174.3 million, distributed among several submarine R&D programs, to focus and accelerate development of a new design submarine to succeed the *Los Angeles* (SSN-688) class.

The first *Los Angeles* class nuclear-powered submarine was commissioned in 1976; the first new design submarine will be commissioned in 1995, an interval of 19 years. Significant improvements have been introduced to the SSN-688 class since its arrival, including under-ice capability, a vertical launch system, improved noise reduction, and an advanced combat system. The growth potential of this design now has been fully exploited, and a new design SSN is planned. Characteristics of the new ship include: quieter operation; higher tactical speed; more effective combat system; more firepower; better Arctic warfare capability; larger operating envelope; and improved controllability.

These qualities build on current strengths of the U.S. submarine force and will result in increased survivability and greater mission flexibility. Margins for future growth will be included. Crew size will be the same as for *Los Angeles* class submarines, despite the increased capability.

The primary reason for developing a new design submarine is the accelerated rate of noise reduction in Soviet submarines, the superior production rate of Soviet nuclear-powered submarines, and the continuing requirement for U.S. submarines to be capable of defeating superior numbers of Soviet submarines in distant, hostile ocean areas.

The Navy's submarine RDT&E programs for fiscal year 1985 are listed below, including an indication of where the $174.3 million was added. Except for the two programs indicated, all these programs support the authorization of the new design SSN in fiscal year 1989. It is not possible to separate programs designed to build the NDSSN from base-line submarine research and development.

[In millions of dollars]

	Base	Delta
Submarine RDT&E programs:		
Submarines (sonar)	$5.4	
Submarine silencing	31.7	$17.9
Operational reactor development	12.9	(1)
Submarine sonar development	31.3	
Advanced submarine support equipment	12.4	
Wide aperture array	11.7	
Submarines (advanced)	153.8	87.6
Submarine tactical warfare systems	21.7	18.1
Attack submarine development	24.1	6.5
Advanced nuclear reactor components	71.4	42.0
SSN-688 class VLS	29.5	(1)
Submarine communication	4.2	
Submarine sonar improvement	40.1	
Navigation systems	0.7	
Wide apertude array (engineering)	14.7	2.2
SUBACS (engineering)	171.2	
Submarine tactical warfare system (engineering)	41.9	
Total	686.1	174.3

[1] SSN-688 only.

The committee strongly supports the Navy's plan to develop a new design SSN, but recommends two reductions which will not affect the new design program: a reduction of $9.908 million in Submarine Sonar Development (Advanced), and $2.0 million in Attack Submarine Development. The remaining programs are perceived as an inter-related package, which the committee supports fully.

NEW DESIGN ATTACK SUBMARINE VALIDATION

The committee directs that prior to October 1, 1984:

(1) The Department of Defense validate the proposed missions and required operational capabilities of the SSN-21 and compare them to the missions and required operational capabilities of the latest configuration of the Improved SSN-688 and previous SSN designs, and

(2) The Department of the Navy make available to the committee detailed briefings on the alternative SSN designs that were considered in developing the SSN-21.

NEW THREAT UPGRADE

The administration requested $51.783 million for the New Threat Upgrade program, which includes development of an improved AN/SPS-49 radar intended for installation on existing guided missile cruisers and destroyers with significant service life remaining. Given the fact that the Navy has already developed this radar and has approved it for production, the committee is concerned that increasing funds continue to be requested.

The committee recommends authorization of $48.783 million for New Threat Upgrade, a reduction of $3.0 million. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a complete funding profile and schedule of events for the New Threat Upgrade program to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 2 weeks after the submission of the fiscal year 1986 budget to the Congress.

PATROL COMBATANT SHIP DEVELOPMENT (ENGINEERING)

The administration originally requested $101.275 million for the Ship Development (Engineering) program. The revised request included $96.275 million, a reduction of $5.0 million. The request funds development and design of various ship classes, including ships soon to begin construction.

The Navy is planning to initiate conceptual and feasibility studies of a new missile-carrying Patrol Combatant (PCM). Current plans include $3 million in fiscal year 1985 for feasibility studies, with preliminary design scheduled to commence in fiscal year 1986. Given the importance of the PCM mission, the committee encourages the Navy to accelerate plans for the PCM, such that production may be authorized in fiscal year 1987.

The committee recommends authorization of $96.275 million for Ship Development (Engineering), a reduction of $5.0 million. Of the total amount, $2.0 million is available only for the PCM, which should be designed by private industry on a competitive basis. Funding for contract design should be included in the fiscal year 1986 budget request.

PENGUIN

The administration requested no funds in fiscal year 1985 for development of the Penguin anti-ship missile system.

The Penguin is a Norwegian anti-ship missile with an infra-red seeker capable of being installed on patrol craft and helicopters. U.S. Navy helicopters currently do not carry anti-ship missiles, but the conflict in the Falklands demonstrated the military significance of such a capability. The Penguin missile is the best available weapon for this purpose. It provides operational flexibility and complements the ship-launched Harpoon.

The committee strongly supports the Navy's plans to equip SH-60 helicopters with Penguin missiles, and recognizes that funds are required to design a weapon or multi-purpose pylon for the aircraft, to test the Penguin missile and helicopter as an integrated system, and to conduct the operational evaluation.

The committee recommends authorization of $14.6 million in RDT&E for the Penguin missile system. The committee also recommends that the $5 million in the fiscal year 1984 WPN account be reprogramed into the fiscal year 1984 RDT&E account to support this effort. Finally, the committee recommends authorization of $11.7 million in the fiscal 1985 APN account for aircraft modifications in support of the Penguin missile program.

PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT

The administration requested $3.532 million for Productivity Improvement.

The committee believes that capital investments which will generate savings should be funded by specific programs which will benefit from those investments.

The committee recommends no funds be authorized for Productivity Improvement.

RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT

The administration originally requested $84.737 million for RDT&E Ship and Aircraft Support. The revised budget request included $82.037 million, a reduction of $2.7 million.

This program has increased significantly above the previous year, when it was funded at a level of $65.738 million, and the increase is not adquately justified.

The committee recommends authorization of $78.737 million, a reduction of $6.0 million.

REGIONAL TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE

The administration originally requested $63.666 million for the Regional Tactical Surveillance program, which is developing an Over-The-Horizon radar for the Navy. The revised request included $31.966 million, a reduction of $31.7 million.

The committee has reviewed the report provided by the administration regarding the Navy and Air Force OTH radar programs, and has received assurances that the two programs have been coordinated, that unnecessary duplication is not occurring, and that the Navy and Air Force have different surveillance requirements which justify different systems to minimize costs. The committee agrees that the operational requirement for this program is well supported.

The committee is concerned that unacceptable program stretchout and increased cost would be likely if funding were reduced to the extent suggested by the DOD budget revision.

The committee recommends authorization of $39.004 million for the Regional Tactical Surveillance program, a reduction of $24.662 million.

SHIP PROPULSION (ADVANCED)

The administration originally requested $47.703 million for the Ship Propulsion (Advanced) program. The budget revision submitted in May included $36.703 million, a reduction of $11.0 million.

The committee remains concerned that Navy RDT&E funding for ship propulsion research is inadequate. Operational requirements, fuel consumption, maintenance and reliability, acquisition costs, and ship system power loads dictate continued support for ship propulsion research.

The committee recommends authorization of $43.703 million for Ship Propulsion (Advanced), a reduction of $4.0 million.

SM-2 (N) SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE

The administration originally requested $25.68 million for development of the nuclear warhead version of the Navy's Standard Missile-2. This nuclear variant is being designed to provide additional range and effectiveness for fleet defense operations.

In its revised budget request, the administration deleted all funding for the SM-2(N) program. Although the committee has not received the Navy's justification for terminating this ongoing program, in view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends without prejudice that no funding be provided.

SUBMARINE ASW STAND-OFF WEAPON

The administration requested $61.659 million for the Submarine Anti-Submarine Warfare Stand-Off Weapon (ASW SOW). This program is developing a successor to the SUBROC weapon, and it will be a long-range, submarine-launched, supersonic missile which carries one of two possible payloads, either a lightweight MK-46 or MK-50 torpedo, or a nuclear depth bomb.

A rocket-thrown ASW weapon is useful in combating high speed submarines which may not be within range for torpedo attack. Both the U.S. and the Soviet navies currently have similar weapons in their inventories. The U.S. weapon is called SUBROC (Submarine Rocket), and it is being retired from service.

Budgetary constraints necessitate undesirable reductions, and the Submarine ASW SOW ranks as a lower priority than other submarine-related R&D programs. This lower priority results primarily from continued high technical risks associated with ASW SOW and the higher mission priority assigned to MK-48 ADCAP and the new design submarine.

The committee recommends authorizing $41.659 million for the Submarine ASW Stand-Off Weapon, which is a reduction of $20 million.

SURFACE SHIP NAVIGATION SYSTEMS

The administration requested $2.959 million for Surface Ship Navigation Systems.

This program would be a new start in fiscal year 1985, and would fund the development of ring laser gyroscopes suitable for employment on surface ships. This technology is already widely accepted for use on aircraft, and it will eventually provide lower cost gyroscopes for shipboard use. However, the technology is continuing to mature, and the lower priority for this program does not justify its approval.

The committee recommends authorization of no funds for Surface Ship Navigation Systems in fiscal year 1985. This reduction is based on affordability, and is made without prejudice against the program.

SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING DEVICES

The administration requested $31.834 million for Surface Warfare Training Devices.

The committee notes that the Navy has been responsive to concerns expressed last year regarding management of this program. However, funding constraints still necessitate a reduction. The committee believes this reduction is within manageable levels and will not unduly affect the program.

The committee recommends authorization of $26.834 million for Surface Training Devices, a reduction of $5 million. The reduction is made without prejudice against the program.

SURTASS

The administration requested $5.751 million for the SURTASS (Surveillance Towed Array Support System) development program. SURTASS consists primarily of very long, acoustic arrays towed behind TAGOS-1 class ocean surveillance ships in support of the Navy's anti-submarine warfare efforts.

Last year, the committee recommended reductions to the SURTASS program because it was proceeding with further development of the UYS-1 signal processor (ASP), specifically a dual-ASP and its associated specialized software. Because the Navy was also funding development of the UYS-2, which is the designated successor to the UYS-1, the SURTASS program was not adequately justified. In the fiscal year 1985 budget, the Navy plans to proceed with the same plan, without providing additional justification.

The committee recommends no funds be authorized for the SURTASS program, a reduction of $5.751 million.

T-700 ENGINE FOR THE SH-2 (LAMPS MK-I) HELICOPTER

The administration requested no funds for integration of the T-700 engine in the SH-2 (LAMPS MK-I) helicopter, even though the program began in fiscal year 1984 and requires additional funding for completion.

Use of the T-700 engine will reduce maintenance requirements and fuel consumption for the SH-2 and will simplify fleet logistics requirements. The SH-2 (LAMPS MK-I) will be in the fleet for many years and the T-700 engine could be installed during scheduled depot level maintenance.

The committee recommends authorization of $17 million for integration and testing of the T-700 engine with the SH-2 (LAMPS MK-I) helicopter.

TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

The administration requested $84.197 million for Target Systems Development. This program includes the Supersonic Low Altitude Target (SLAT) project.

The committee recognizes that a high degree of flexibility exists in selecting an adequate degree of instrumentation for testing. A reduction can be accommodated in this program without any adverse effect on the SLAT development project, which the committee accords a high priority.

The committee recommends authorization of $82.197 million, a reduction of $2.0 million.

TRIDENT II MISSILE

The administration requested $2,091.1 million to continue full scale engineering development of the Trident II (D–5) missile. The Trident II will carry larger payloads and will be more accurate than the Trident I, thus providing an at-sea and survivable capability to put hard targets at risk. The fiscal year 1985 request also includes $138.5 million for the first increment of Trident II production funding, as well as $24.5 million for long-lead funding for navigation, guidance, and reentry system components.

Included in the original administration request for Trident II research and development was $30 million for the development of penetration aids for the Trident II. This request was reduced by $15 million in the administration's amended budget request. In view of testimony received by the committee this year regarding Soviet ABM capabilities, and the potential for a Soviet break-out of the 1972 ABM Treaty, the committee believes that penetration aids research, including consideration of an evader MARV, should be undertaken on a priority basis. This is especially urgent in the case of Trident II, on which so much of our deterrent strength will depend in the 1990's. The committee, therefore, recommends that $25 million be authorized for PENAIDS research. This constitutes a reduction of $5 million in the total research and development request for Trident II. Moreover, the Department of Defense is directed to submit a report not later than February 1, 1985, indicating proposed plans to respond to penetration threats to the SLBM force posed by expanded Soviet ballistic missile defenses in the near-term (before 1986), mid-term (before 1990), and long-term (after 1990).

The committee recommends that $2,086.1 million be authorized for Trident II RDT&E, and that the full amount requested for procurement, including advanced procurement, be authorized.

U.S. CONSTRUCTION OF DUAL-USE SHIPS

The committee is aware of industry proposals for dual-use passenger/military multi-purpose vessels to be constructed in the United States that would provide a cost effective approach to enhancing our sealift and combat auxiliary capability.

Of the funds available in Navy Research and Development for Ship Development (Engineering), the Navy is directed to make available $2 million to the private sector to develop initial contract plans and specifications to determine the feasibility of the concept. The committee directs the Department of the Navy to issue an interim report to the committee no later than November 15, 1984 that discusses the progress of the effort up to that date and a plan for further steps in developing such private sector proposals. Not later than March 15, 1985 the committee expects to be provided a final report that discusses specific plans, specifications and approaches to enhance our sealift and combat auxiliary capability.

USMC LOW COST FLIR

Currently, one of the more significant deficiencies in our tactical air forces lies in their ability to fight at night. While air-to-air engagements may be conducted safely at night relying strictly on radar, low level ground attack and close air support missions require night vision equipment. This equipment may be either Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) systems or night vision goggles.

The most recent Defense Department FLIR developments to provide tactical aircraft night fighting capabilities include the Army TADS/PNVS, Navy F/A-18 FLIR, and the Air Force LANTIRN system. Each of these systems is expensive (in the range of $2.0 million or more for hardware costs) and will be procured in limited numbers.

Subsequent to the submission of the administration's fiscal year 1985 budget request, the Marine Corps began evaluating a British-made FLIR which, combined with night goggles, appears to offer excellent night attack potential at a fraction of the cost of current systems. The total estimated cost of this system, including procurement and aircraft modifications, is less than $.5 million each. If successfully developed, this system could be installed on Marine AV-8B's, F/A-18's, and A-4's, and could be proliferated on Navy and Air Force attack aircraft as well. This effort may also provide badly needed competitive pressure to reduce the cost of current DOD FLIR systems.

The committee supports this effort to develop competitively a low cost night fighting capability for Marine attack aircraft and recommends authorization of $12.0 million for research and development of a Marine low cost FLIR system.

VTX–TS

The administration requested $113.4 million for research and development of the Undergraduate Jet Flight Training System (VTX-TS). The VTX-TS program is intended to develop both a training aircraft (VTX) and training system (TS) which will replace the T-2C and the TA-4J aircraft currently in the Navy's pilot training program.

The committee continues to support strongly this effort to replace two Navy trainer aircraft with a single, more modern and efficient aircraft. The VTX-TS aircraft, now designated the T-45, is expected to produce a substantial savings in operating costs over the current inventory of trainers.

In the amended budget request, the administration proposed a reduction of $45.0 million from the original request of $113.4 million for the VTX. This reduction will result in the delay of the initial training capability (ITC) of the system from 1989 to 1991. Such a delay will require the Navy to take extraordinary management steps to extend the usefulness of the diminishing number of available T-2C and TA-4J training aircraft. This may require that the TA-4J, with a current service life of 12,000 hours, be extended an additional 3,000 hours. It will also require the Navy to reclaim T-2 and TA-4J aircraft currently assigned to units outside the Naval Air Training Command in order to ensure an adequate inventory for training purposes. The cost implications of these decisions have not been provided to the committee. The committee therefore requests the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report establishing the latest development and procurement schedules along with an explanation of the funding impact of delaying the ITC from 1989 to 1991. This report should take into account the cost of extending the service life of the TA-4J's as well as any other ancillary expenses incurred as a result of this 2-year delay.

Strictly on the basis of congressionally mandated budget reductions, the committee recommends an authorization of $68.4 million for research and development of the Navy's VTX-TS program, a reduction of $45.0 million from the administration's request.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REDUCTIONS

In his budget revision to the fiscal year 1985 authorization request, the Secretary of Defense identified several Navy RDT&E programs for reductions with which the committee concurs.

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Request	Recommendation	Reduction
Environmental applications	$8.287	$6.287	−$2.0
Oceanographic instrumentation	5.867	3.367	−2.5
Manpower control systems	5.020	2.520	−2.5
Advanced marine biology	5.186	4.686	−0.5
Ocean engineering technical development	18.876	15.876	−2.0
Education and training	5.008	3.508	−1.5
Environmental protection	10,517	8.017	−2.5
Mine development (engineering)	18.841	13.841	−5.0
Fleet tactical development and evaluation	16.353	14.853	−1.5
Fleet telecommunications (tactical)	75.346	70.346	−5.0
Underseas surveillance	29.725	28.225	−1.5

REDUCTIONS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

The committee recommends reductions to the following programs as indicated:

[In millions of dollars]

	Request	Recommendation	Reduction
Undersea target surveillance	$45.690	$39.690	−$6.0
Surface/aerospace surveil tech	36.387	34.637	−1.8
Human factors and simulation tech	7.967	6.967	−1.0
Personnel and training tech	6.456	5.456	−1.0
CV ASW module	5.289	4.289	−1.0
BGAAWC	12.991	9.991	−3.0
Surface MCM	30.276	29.276	−1.0
Shipboard damage control	20.419	18.419	−2.0
Surface ASW	20.863	17.863	−3.0

	Request	Recommendation	Reduction
Command and control (advanced)	27.384	14.884	−12.5
Facilities improvement	10.477	8.977	−1.5
Shipboard EW improvement	49.819	44.819	−5.0
Electronic warfare	14.254	13.254	−1.0
Counter C3 development	30.189	28.189	−2.0
Range instrument and sys dev	20.273	18.273	−2.0
Training and personnel sys dev	5.636	4.636	−1.0
RDT&E lab and facility mgmnt	64.569	61.569	−3.0
Command and Control (engineering)	53.558	50.558	−3.0
JINTACCS	16.263	11.763	−4.5

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction in the Navy RDT&E account of $27.248 million. Of this reduction $17.248 million may not be applied against technology base programs.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

[Dollars in thousands]

Line number		Fiscal year 1985 request	Change from request	Commmittee recommendation
	Technology base	($777,656)	(−$14,000)	($763,656)
1	In-House independent research	16,826	−1,800	15,026
11	Advanced weapons	44,794	−5,000	39,794
—	Undistributed reduction		−7,200	−7,200
	Advanced technology development	(583,980)	(−44,500)	(539,480)
17	Advanced avionics for aircraft	21,822	−1,000	20,822
18	Flight vehicle technology	20,917	−2,000	18.917
30	Advanced systems integration demonstration	33,155	−1,500	31,655
32	Space and missile rocket propulsion	5,547	−2,000	3,547
38	Advanced spacecraft technology	30,726	−18,000	12,726
39	Advanced military spaceflight technology	2,829	−1,800	1,029
44	Advanced radiation technology	12,399	−6,200	6,199
48	Civil/environmental engineering technology	17,247	−3,000	14,247
—	Undistributed reduction		−9,000	−9,000
	Strategic programs	(6,068,703)	(−124,754)	(5,943,949)
58	Common strategic rotary launcher	77,304	−8,000	69,304
60	Advanced strategic missile system	108,304	+10,000	118,304
63	Advanced air-to-surface missile	54,418	−26,000	28,418
71	ICBM modernization	2,440,786	−77,300	2,363,486
73	Air launched cruise missile	28,039	−3,000	25,039
81	SAC communications	1,546	+1,546	3,092
86	Surveillance radar stations/sites	11,890	−2,000	9,890
87	DEW radar stations	63,094	−1,000	62,094
97	MEECN	116,920	−5,000	111,920
99	AFSATCOM	141,592	−14,000	127,592
	Tactical programs	(2,954,397)	(−83,409)	(2,870,988)
123	Aircraft avionics equipment development	25,809	−5,800	20,809
127	Electronic warfare counter-responsive	23,917	−4,400	19,517
129	Alternate fighter engine	56,943	−2,000	54,943
—	C–5 demonstration	0	+2,000	2,000
131	Modular automatic test equipment	15,798	−1,000	14,798
133	Aircraft engine component program	149,785	−3,200	146,585
134	Defense suppression weapons engineering	14,795	−10,000	4,795
136	AMRAAM	217,749	−8,000	209,749
138	JTACMS	35,509	−35,509	0
141	Armament ordnance development	20,764	−2,000	18,764
149	Airbase survivability and recovery	18,092	−3,000	15,092
151	Life support system	15,649	−2,000	13,649
155	Tac C^3 countermeasures	28,100	−3,000	25,100
159	Protective systems	48,565	−3,000	43,565
160	Tactical protective systems	86,631	−4,000	82,631
161	Computer resources management technology	12,358	−2,500	9,858
164	Combat helicopter modernization	81,306	−47,000	34,306
172	F–15 squadrons	82,867	+146,950	229,767
174	Fighter derivative aircraft	146,950	−146,950	0
175	F–16 squadrons	83,428	+24,000	107,428
180	Tactical air control system	28,397	−4,000	24,397
181	Airborne warning and control system	76,595	−2,000	74,595
191	Have Flag	(.........)	+33,000	+33,000

Line number		Fiscal year 1985 request	Change from request	Commmittee recommendation
	Intelligence and communications	(2,018,033)	(−$49,105)	($1,968,928)
211	Intel Comm & Def Spec Security System	(.........)	−1,105	−1,105
217	Special Sys activities	(.........)	−48,000	−48,000
	Defensewide mission support	(1,999,186)	(−99,680)	(1,899,506)
227	Flight simulator development (F-15E)	149,880	+4,200	154,080
228	Space shuttle	345,764	−20,000	325,764
231	Range improvement	16,771	−1,000	15,771
232	Electromagnetic radiation test facility	7,811	−900	6,911
233	Improved R&D	75,054	−4,300	70,754
238	Nav/radar/sled track test support	18,749	−1,100	17,649
239	Acquisition and Command Spt	354,130	−800	353,330
240	T&E support	437,464	−18,100	419,364
246	WMMCCS ADP	680	−680	0
253	Industrial preparedness	61,859	−4,000	57,859
255	Productibility/reliability/availability/maintainability	14,865	−1,000	13,865
—	Undistributed reduction		−52,000	−52,000
	Undistributed reduction		−14,000	−14,000
	Total, RDT&E, Air Force	14,401,955	−429,448	13,972,507

ADVANCED AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE (AASM)

The administration originally requested $54.4 million for this new start program to begin development of a second generation Short-Range Attack Missile (SRAM). The Advanced Air-to-Surface Missile (AASM) will provide the B-1B and the Advanced Technology Bomber with a supersonic, low radar cross section, air-to-ground nuclear missile. The missile is intended to enhance bomber effectiveness, maintain employment flexibility, and stress enemy defenses.

In the amended budget request, the administration identified a $26 million reduction in this program that will delay full-scale development activity until fiscal year 1986, and therefore delay the IOC.

Testimony received by the committee this year was convincing with regard to the need for a SRAM replacement, both to hedge against the failure of the existing SRAM, which has already exceeded its design life, and also to enhance unique bomber operational capabilities. In view of budget constraints, however, the committee reluctantly concurs with the reduction identified by the Department of Defense.

ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (EJS)

The administration requested $87.0 million for research and development of the Advanced Communication System. Under this program, also referred to as the Enhanced JTIDS System (EJS), the Air Force will develop a jam-resistant, tactical voice communications system capable of operating in the threat environment postulated for the late 1980's and early 1990's.

The Congress has expressed concern over the fact that the Air Force was proceeding with the development of an Air Force—exclusive system that would not be interoperable with either Army or Navy communications systems. It appears this problem has been resolved and the Air Force will develop the Advanced Communications System in two phases: the first phase will be interoperable with Army and Navy JTIDS using the Time Distributed Multiple Access TDMA) architecture. This system will operate in the L-band and will provide an acceptable margin of anti-jam performance. The second phase, will operate in the "alternate band" and will provide the higher level of anti-jam performance required by the Air Force during the 1990's. The committee endorses this approach.

The committee believes the architecture for this dual-band approach must be developed at the inception of the program to avoid costly retrofitting of aircraft and equipment. Therefore, every effort should be made in the development of the first phase of the two phase program to ensure compatibility with the second phase. The committee believes it is essential to ensure that the initial L-band TDMA-like system be capable of growing to the higher anti-jam performance of the EJS "alternate band" system.

The committee recommends authorization of $87.0 million for research and development of the Advanced Communication System.

ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEM

The administration originally requested $108.3 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of advanced guidance and reentry systems. This compares with $74.3 million approved for this purpose in fiscal year 1984.

This program provides options to maintain ICBM force effectiveness against improved threats. The program includes: penetration aids for Peacekeeper Minuteman III, and the small ICBM; maneuvering reentry vehicle (MARV)/terminal fix system (TFS) options for a late 1990's IOC; severe environmental nosetip and advanced reentry systems designs; advanced penetration and defense penetration systems; and concept studies.

In the amended budget submission, the administration identified a $12.7 million reduction associated with development of maneuvering reentry vehicles. This reduction and an associated reduction in the ICBM modernization program, will delay the start of MARV prototype design and TFS studies, and move the IOC of MARV/TFS from 1995 to 1998.

During the course of several hearings this year, the committee heard testimony with regard to Soviet anti-ballistic missile capabilities, and in particular, with regard to the potential of the Soviet Union to break out of the constraints of the ABM Treaty. The committee is concerned that the various research programs that represent our hedge against such a break out are not being given sufficient priority. Consequently, the committee recommends that funding for the Advanced Strategic Missile System program be increased by $10 million over the original request for additional penetration related research, including consideration of evader MARVs. Furthermore, the committee directs that the Department of Defense report not later than February 1, 1985 on the steps being taken to hedge against the possibility of expanded Soviet ballistic missile defenses appearing in the near-term (before 1986), in the mid-term (before 1990), and in the far-term (after 1990).

C-5A AIRCRAFT DEMONSTRATION

The administration did not request authorization of research and development funds in fiscal year 1985 for a demonstration program of C-5A airlift aircraft capabilities.

The Air Force and Lockheed Corporation have been exploring an appropriate demonstration program to further establish the full range of the C-5A aircraft's capabilities. There is uncertainty as to the C-5A's strategic and tactical airlift capabilities, especially in routine and safe operations from austere or unpaved airfields. The committee believes that it is essential that the Department of Defense realize the full operational potential of the present inventory of airlift assets, especially in light of the substantial shortfall in current airlift capabilities.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to complete a comprehensive demonstration program to clearly establish the operational capabilities of the C-5A aircraft. While aircraft backing and heavyweight operations appear to be the most promising aspects of such a demonstration program, the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the capabilities of the C-5A aircraft to operate routinely and safely from austere or unpaved airfields are clarified during this demonstration program.

The committee recommends authorization of $2.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for a demonstration program of C-5A aircraft capabilities. The intent of the committee is that these funds may be used by the Department of Defense only for this demonstration program.

C-17 AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration initially requested $129.285 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of a new airlift aircraft, the C-17. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $123.285 million. No justification for this revision was presented. The request for fiscal year 1985 will fund full-scale engineering development.

The C-17 will be capable of carrying all classes of airlift cargo, including outsize, over intercontinental distances into small, austere airfields. The C-17's small airfield capability is important because C-5, C-141, and Civil Reserve Air Fleet aircraft are limited to operating between major aerial ports. Cargo airlifted by current intertheater aircraft must be moved to its final destination within the theater by C-130 aircraft or via surface means. As of now, all outsize combat equipment must be moved to its final destination by surface means because it cannot be loaded into C-130's. The C-17 will provide the capability to airlift outsize cargoes within the theater. In addition, the C-17 will eliminate the inefficiencies and delays of transshipment.

The C-17 aircraft will also serve to offset shortfalls in strategic airlift capabilities that will remain following procurement of 50 C-5B's and 60 KC-10A's. In addition, it will replace C-141's and some C-130's when they reach the end of their service lives in the 1990's.

During February 1984, the Department of Defense submitted to the committee the C-17 Validation Report required by the Defense Authorization Conference Report for fiscal year 1984. This C-17 report validates the requirement, concepts, and design of the C–17 aircraft. Among the key conclusions of this report are the following:

After completion of current procurement programs, airlift capability will remain approximately 25 percent below the minimum level identified in the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study;

Due to airfield congested problems, additional airlift forces must be able to operate routinely through small austere airfields not suited to current intertheater airlift;

Without the C–17, it will not be possible to transport heavy, outsized Army equipment to a vast majority of small austere airfields;

The C–17 takes advantage of today's proven technology being used on many commercial aircraft;

The acceleration, deceleration, climb, and descent rates of the C–17 increase survivability in a hostile environment;

To ensure low support costs, the C–17 contract contains a unique warranty with specific reliability, maintainability, and availability parameters; and

The inherent capability of the C–17 to perform both the inter- and intratheater missions will produce significantly reduced life cycle cost, particularly in manpower, over any multi-aircraft solution.

In September 1983, the Air Force completed the Airlift Master Plan. This long-range planning document recommends acquisition of 180 primary mission C–17's, within a total of 210, to meet the minimum intertheater airlift requirement, increase intratheater capability, and modernize both the active and reserve airlift force structure.

The committee recommends authorization of $129.285 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of the C–17 airlift aircraft, the amount initially requested by the administration.

CENTER FOR ADVANCED CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE

The committee recognizes the great potential of precision-guided, or "smart" weapons/munitions to improve the conventional war fighting capabilities of the United States and its allies, thereby reducing reliance on nuclear weapons to deter conflict.

The committee has learned that there is high-level interest in the Defense Department in establishing a "Center for Advanced Conventional Defense" to assist the military services in their efforts to develop and deploy these smart munitions in a timely and cost-effective manner.

The committee agrees that such a Center, which would work closely with the military services to explore the development of smart munitions technologies and to coordinate outside research efforts in this area, could be a useful resource to the Defense Department.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Defense Department to make available a total of not more than $2.0 million from within existing resources to permit the preparation of a plan for the establishment and operation of this Center. This plan should include the management structure, mission objectives, related tasks and a full program, including specific milestones, for establishing and operating such a Center. Should the Defense Department make resources available to draft such a plan, the committee requests that the plan be submitted to the Congress as soon as possible during fiscal year 1985.

DISTANT EARLY WARNING (DEW) LINE RADAR

The administration requested $63.1 million for research and development, and $37.7 million for procurement of the Distant Early Warning (DEW) Line Radar in fiscal year 1985.

The DEW Line, extending from Alaska to Greenland, is intended to provide tactical early warning of bomber and cruise missile attacks against the North American Continent. Over the years, the effectiveness of the existing system (initially deployed in 1957) has steadily eroded. Today, there exist gaps in coverage, low altitude coverage is limited, and maintenance costs are very high. Through this modernization program, the capabilities of the DEW Line will be significantly upgraded and operations costs will be reduced.

In its revised budget, the administration recommended a $10.0 million reduction in procurement, which delays some communications upgrades, and a $1.0 million reduction in research and development funding, which reflects revised funding requirements for the fabrication of two short range radars. In view of budgetary constraints, the committee reluctantly supports these adjustments. The committee, therefore, recommends $27.7 million for procurement, and $62.1 million for research and development of the DEW Line radar upgrade program in fiscal year 1985.

HH-60A NIGHT HAWK

The administration requested $81.3 million for research and development of the HH-60A Night Hawk helicopter for the Air Force.

The HH-60A Night Hawk program was initiated to develop a variant of an existing helicopter to perform the Air Force Combat Rescue (CR) and Special Operations Forces (SOF) missions.

One year ago the Air Force proposed the HH-60D Night Hawk program consisting of 243 aircraft with highly sophisticated mission equipment packages at a cost greater than $5 billion. The Congress refused to support such an ambitious program and directed the Air Force to reevaluate their requirements and consider a more austere approach to meeting the CR and SOF mission requirements.

In the fiscal year 1985 budget request, the program was restructured to 155 aircraft at a cost of $2.9 billion. Following the budget submission, the program underwent a further reduction and now consists of just 90 aircraft at a total Weapon System Cost less than $1.0 billion.

The HH-60A aircraft will be a derivative of the Army's very successful UH-60A Blackhawk. The HH-60A Night Hawk will be equipped with a rescue hoist, refueling capability, a Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) system, improved navigation equipment, and other limited modifications necessary to perform the Combat Rescue mission.

The committee commends the Air Force for its efforts to acquire this essential capability at a reasonable cost. These efforts have reduced the fiscal year 1985 funding requirement by $47.0 million.

The committee recommends authorization of $34.3 million for research and development of the HH-60A Night Hawk.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)

The administration requested $98.3 million for Air Force research and development of the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS). The JSTARS is a joint Army and Air Force program designed to develop an airborne engagement system to detect and track moving formations of enemy surface units, and to guide accurate attacks against moving or fixed ground targets.

The committee notes the progress made by the Army and Air Force during the past year in developing operational requirements for the JSTARS multiple mode capabilities; these include wide area, moving target indicating surveillance; medium resolution fixed target indication, and weapon guidance. The committee also notes the joint progress in advancing program definition through a single system specification and the initiation of competitive source selection of the prime contractor for full scale development.

While there is little disagreement over the need to develop the capabilities envisioned for the JSTARS system, much controversy has surrounded the selection of the JSTARS platform. The candidates for this mission are the Army OV-1 Mohawk and the Air Force TR-1 and C-18 (a used Boeing 707).

The issue between the two Air Force aircraft focuses on the relative survivability of the two platforms. According to the Air Force, each aircraft has peculiar advantages and disadvantages, but neither is notably more survivable than the other. It is curious that the question of survivability is seldom raised with regard to the OV-1, which is a much slower platform that will operate at lower altitudes and closer to the battle area than will either the C-18 or TR-1.

The committee believes the preferred (and certainly the least expensive) approach would be to have one platform rather than two performing this mission with both Services sharing the targeting information and weapons guidance capabilities of the same platform.

Subsequent to the submission of the fiscal year 1985 budget request, the Army and Air Force reached an agreement in which a single aircraft type (an Air Force C-18) would be used by both Services to provide stand-off targeting information. The committee supports this cooperative approach to performing this very important mission.

The committee recommends an authorization of $98.3 million for the Air Force research and development of the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System.

JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (JTACMS)

The administration requested $35.5 million for Air Force research and development of the Joint Tactical Missile System

(JTACMS). This effort would initiate full scale engineering development of an air-launched, stand-off missile to be employed as an interdiction or "deep strike" weapon. Funds were also requested for the Army to develop a ground-launched version of JTACMS.

The committee continues to support strongly the effort to develop a deep interdiction, stand-off weapon. Although originally envisioned as an anti-armor weapon, the concept of employment of the JTACMS has evolved considerably over the past 2 years. Operating in conjunction with the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) the JTACMS may also be used to attack choke points, bridges, railheads communications and intelligence centers, POL and ammunition storage areas, and other high value fixed targets.

Whether employed against fixed or mobile targets, the benefits derived from avoiding exposure of expensive, manned aircraft to the defenses attending such high value targets appear to justify the development of this concept.

The Air Force has chosen to evaluate various advanced technology concepts to achieve this capability. These efforts are funded separately and need not be duplicated under this program element. Therefore, the committee recommends that the request for $35.5 million for research and development of the JTACMS under this program element be denied.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND (MAC) COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM

The administration initially requested $4.413 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of the MAC Command and Control System. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $3.413 million. No justification for this revision was presented.

This research and development program will upgrade the MAC Command Post and will develop basic communications and information processing support to all command and control echelons of the MAC system. Various studies have documented MAC command and control deficiencies. To make optimum use of scarce airlift resources, an upgrade of the MAC Command and Control System is required.

The committee, therefore, recommends authorization of $4.413 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of the MAC Command and Control System, the funding level initially requested by the administration.

MILSTAR

The administration requested a total of $466.6 million for research and development for the military strategic tactical and relay (MILSTAR) system, including $325 million for the satellite. The request also included $12.5 million for related procurement.

MILSTAR, a major initiative of the President's strategic modernization program, will provide two-way survivable and enduring secure voice and data connectivity to our decisionmakers, sensors and forces. It will utilize extremely high frequencies and other techniques to attain levels of survivability that will insure that the minimum essential communications required during wartime are available. Deployment of the MILSTAR will begin in the late 1980s and continue into the 1990s.

The committee strongly endorses this important strategic C^3 initiative and recommends authorization of the full amount requested.

NIGHT PRECISION ATTACK (LANTIRN)

The administration requested a total of $98.3 million for research and development of the LANTIRN system.

The LANTIRN system consists of two externally mounted pods designed to permit fighter aircraft to conduct low altitude strike and interdiction missions at night and under the weather. The system consists of navigation and targeting Forward Looking Infra-Red (FLIR) systems, terrain following radar, a laser target designator, missile boresight correlator and the necessary cooling equipment.

While the committee repeatedly expressed concern over the rapidly rising cost estimates of the LANTIRN system during the initial development stages, for the past 2 years these costs have remained constant. The full scale development contract is being performed on a fixed price basis and the Air Force has recently negotiated a production proposal within the funding cap imposed on the program. This proposal is based on a fixed price incentive (FPI) contract with a target price of $2.7 billion for 720 systems and a ceiling price of approximately $3.1 billion.

One year ago, in the report accompanying the fiscal year 1984 Department of Defense Authorization Act (Senate Report No. 98–213) the House and Senate conferees agreed to fund those aspects of the LANTIRN program necessary to evaluate the performance of the initial development pods. The conferees expressly disapproved the expenditure of any funds to initiate production or production readiness. The conferees also agreed that a necessary prerequisite to commence production was the successful demonstration of flight testing of the total system along with achieving a fixed price production agreement within the program's cost ceiling.

Flight testing of the navigation pods has progressed well, however, technical problems with the targeting pod have delayed the overall flight test schedule. As a result of these delays, the conditions agreed to by the fiscal year 1984 authorization conferees have not been met.

The committee is therefore not disposed to recommend a full production go-ahead.

The delays in the flight test program have posed a dilemma for the Air Force and the LANTIRN manufactuer. While they have negotiated a fixed-price production proposal, they still lack the successful system demonstration upon which a production go-ahead is conditioned, and are concerned the fixed-price production option may be lost due to the schedule slip. And it is likely that if the production schedule is slipped, the price will rise.

The committee, however, is unsympathetic to this concern. The delays in the flight test program resulted from technical problems in the system and were not caused by the Air Force. Therefore, such delays should not be used as an excuse to restructure the program and raise the price. If the program cannot absorb the delays caused by these problems without breaching the cost ceiling, consideration should be given to substantially reducing the scope of, or even terminating the program.

The committee does not recommend initiating production of the targeting pod until the conditions reflected in the conference report which accompanied the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984 have been met. However, the committee does recommend authorization of $118.3 million to begin production of the navigation pod and $98.3 million in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) funding for continued development of the LANTIRN system.

SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEMS

The administration requested $143.28 million for research and development, and $65.2 million for procurement of Space Defense Systems in fiscal year 1985. In addition, $17.8 million was requested for advance procurement. This program funds the U.S. miniature homing vehicle (MHV) anti-satellite (ASAT) program.

The U.S. ASAT program was initiated under the Carter administration. The F-15 launched MHV ASAT will be capable of putting at risk Soviet satellites in low altitude. It will not, and need not, be able to attack Soviet early-warning satellites in higher orbits.

The committee has held extensive hearings on space defense matters, with particular emphasis on the Soviet space warfare threat and possible U.S. responses. The committee is very concerned by the range of Soviet capabilities to attack U.S. satellites. The Soviets have the world's only operational ASAT weapon in their co-orbital system, and they have enjoyed this monopoly for over a decade. Although somewhat limited, this system has proved effective in 9 of 15 tests. In addition, the Soviets have probable ASAT capabilities in two ground based test lasers at Sary Shagan. They are also believed to be able to conduct electronic warfare against U.S. satellites with sufficient power to damage or interrupt their functions. The Soviets could also, with minor modifications, obtain ASAT capabilities with their GALOSH ABM interceptors and their ballistic missiles.

In view of the wide range of Soviet ASAT capabilities, and the threat these pose to a large number of very important U.S. satellites, the committee supports proceeding with the development and eventual deployment of a U.S. ASAT system. Not only would such a system pose some degree of deterrence to Soviet attacks on U.S. satellites, but it would also deny the Soviets a sanctuary in space from which to target U.S. and allied terrestrial forces.

The committee has also reviewed the administration's Report to the Congress on U.S. ASAT Arms Control Policy of March 31, 1984. Due to the comprehensive Soviet ASAT threat, and the almost insurmountable verification problems associated with comprehensive ASAT arms control, the committee generally concurs with the conclusions of this report. The committee finds no comfort in these conclusions, and it encourages the administration to continue to explore more limited arms control arrangements in this area that would be both verifiable and contribute to U.S. national security.

The committee believes that there is an important linkage between ASAT arms control considerations and the continued development of the U.S. MHV ASAT program. Language has therefore been included in the bill that repeals previous restrictions on ASAT testing, and substitutes a new requirement that would preclude ASAT testing unless the President determines and certifies that proceeding with the ASAT program, including all necessary testing, is compatible with, and essential to the accomplishment of arms control agreements affecting antisatellite weapons that are effectively verifiable and consistent with the national security interests of the United States.

In connection with the diverse Soviet capabilities to attack U.S. satellites, the committee has reviewed efforts to date in improving the survivability of U.S. satellites and their associated ground control and processing networks. The committee is impressed both by the scope of planned activities, which it considers long overdue, and by the magnitude of the work which remains to be accomplished. The committee again expresses its support for defense-wide efforts to improve satellite and ground network survivability and to improve the Nation's capability for continued access to space both in peacetime and in conflict.

In this regard, the committee directs the administration to conduct a comprehensive study of satellite and ground network survivability in a range of conflicts, both conventional and nuclear. This report should address the reconstitution of minimum essential assets during crisis, including the application of deep basing facilities for this purpose. This report shall be forwarded to the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives prior to submission of the fiscal year 1986 budget.

The committee recommends that Space Defense Systems be funded as requested.

WEATHER SYSTEMS

The administration requested $8.283 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development of weather systems.

This program provides several efforts to upgrade weather support to the Air Force and Army. These include development of equipment to process, display, and disseminate weather data and forecasts in fixed-base and tactical weather stations, and development of a doppler weather radar. This last effort is the Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD), a joint program of the Departments of Defense, Commerce, and Transportation. The committee assigns high priority to these development efforts, especially the NEXRAD program, and recommends authorization of the full amount requested.

DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT

The administration requested $1,999.2 million in research and development associated with Air Force defensewide mission support activities. This represents a 22 percent increase over the amount authorized and appropriated for this purpose in fiscal year 1984. In view of budget constraints, the committee recommends, without prejudice, an undistributed reduction of $52.0 million from the amount requested for Air Force defensewide mission activities.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

[Dollars in thousands]

Line number		Fiscal year 1985 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
	Technology base	($832,688)	(−$4,700)	($827,988)
6	Tactical Technology	109,000	−4,700	104,300
	Advanced Technology Development	(1,993,311)	(−10,000)	(1,983,311)
19	Exp Eval of Major Innovative Tech	204,300	−10,000	194,300
	Strategic Programs	(59,444)	(+24,200)	(83,644)
—	Autonomous terminal homing	0	+24,200	24,200
	Tactical Programs	(2,134)	(....)	(2,134)
	Intelligence and Communications	(1,708,531)	(−37,055)	(1,671,476)
30	Cryptologic activities		−19,255	−19,255
—	Classified Project (DMA)		−5,000	−5,000
39	Defense Reconaissance Spt Activities	380,713	−12,800	367,913
	Defensewide Mission Support	(111,798)	(−17,900)	(93,898)
43	Special Technology Office	7,950	−3,000	4,950
44	CI and Special Technology	10,136	−10,136	0
45	Manufacturing Technology	3,100	−1,864	1,236
47	PA&E Support	3,231	−800	2,431
48	Support to Policy	7,714	−1,600	6,114
50	General Support MRA&L	2,939	−500	2,439
—	Strategic Defense Initiative		−150,000	−150,000
	Undistributed reduction		−5,300	−5,300
	Total, RDT&E, Defense Agencies	4,707,906	−200,755	4,507,151
	Director, Test and Evaluation	(62,000)	(−3,000)	(59,000)
2	Test and Evaluation	50,000	−3,000	47,000

GENERAL SUPPORT TO MANPOWER, RESERVE AFFAIRS AND LOGISTICS

The administration requested $2.939 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development for General Support to Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics,

This program provides resources to support studies of a general nature in manpower, personnel, and logistics research. Funds requested in fiscal year 1985 will address issues of military and civilian manpower requirements, management, and utilization and logistics management operations.

The committee recommends authorization of $2.439 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development for General Support to Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics, a reduction of $0.5 million from the administration's request.

GENERAL SUPPORT TO POLICY

The administration initially requested $7.7 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development for General Support to Policy.

In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $6.1 million.

This program provides support studies and contractual support to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy).

The committee recommends authorization of $6.1 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development for General Support to Policy.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

The administration requested $1.78 billion for research and development associated with the Strategic Defense Initiative in fiscal year 1985.

Background

On March 23, 1983, President Reagan issued a challenge to our technical and policy communities. He directed, fully in compliance with our commitments under the 1972 ABM Treaty, "a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles."

As a result of this Presidential directive, two separate panels were organized to address the technological and policy challenges and opportunities represented by the President's directive. A Future Security Strategy Study addressed the policy implications of developing U.S. strategic defenses; and a Defensive Technology Study addressed the status of the technologies involved in strategic defense. These two efforts were completed in October 1983, and subsequently integrated. Their conclusion was that powerful new technologies are becoming available that justify a major technology development effort to provide future technical options for defense against nuclear ballistic missiles.

In January of this year, the President directed a refocused, reorganized and aggressive research effort designed to explore the promise and address the uncertainties associated with the development of a U.S. strategic defense capability. The resulting Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) drew together a number of ongoing research and development programs related to strategic defense. Prior to the President's speech last year, the funding associated with these ongoing programs was projected to amount to $1.53 billion in fiscal year 1985. The revised budget for the Strategic Defense Initiative in fiscal year 1985 called for $1.78 billion. This approximate 15 percent increase represents only modest increases in most program areas, with significant percentage increases in the area of survivability and lethality studies. These areas were identified by the Defensive Technology Study as important areas of uncertainty.

Recommendation

The committee commends the thrust of the President's vision, which seeks an alternative to our current sole reliance on offensive retaliation to deter Soviet attack. The committee conducted extensive hearings examining the threat, and the details of the SDI itself. The committee believes that in view of ongoing Soviet efforts to develop a comprehensive strategic defensive capability, and the important contribution that a U.S. strategic defensive capability could make to our deterrent posture, such an aggressive technology research program is both prudent and necessary. The committee believes that it is important to provide a future administration with adequate information on which to base a possible deployment decision. Ironically, in citing the challenges confronting the SDI, most of its critics agree on the need for a research program in compliance with the ABM Treaty.

The committee recognizes that at the outset of such a major technological and policy undertaking, there inevitably will be uncertainty about the precise focus and goals of the program, and about the reactions of our allies and adversaries alike. A clearer articulation of the goals, and assessments of the many faceted implications of the program, including its implications for arms control, will be essential if the committee is to support the substantial funding increases proposed beyond fiscal year 1985. Moreover, the committee is concerned that the focus of the program on a thoroughly effective strategic defense in the long term may not adequately provide for—and may in fact detract from—the development of more limited deployment options to hedge against the breakout of significant Soviet ballistic missile defenses in the nearer term.

The committee is encouraged by the appointment of a Director for the SDI with a distinguished record as a strong and effective program manager. In addition, the Department of Defense is commended for the charter of the SDI Organization, which appears to provide the Director with the resource allocation and program management authority the committee believes is essential to the success of the SDI. The committee looks forward to working with the new Director in implementing this important initiative.

Strategic defense initiative funding

[Dollars in million]	*Fiscal year 1985 request*
RDT&E:	
Surveillance, acquisition tracking and kill assessment	$721.0
Directed energy weapons	489.0
Kinetic energy weapons	356.0
System concepts, battle management and C^3	99.0
Survivability, lethality and subsystems	112.0
Total	1,777.0

The committee believes that significant reductions in the fiscal year 1985 request for the SDI would have the effect of curtailing programs that have enjoyed the support of Congress in past years, and are essential on their own merits quite aside from their application to the SDI. In view of fiscal year 1985 budgetary constraints, however, the committee cannot recommend the full $1.78 billion requested, and instead recommends a reduction of $150 million. This reduction is to be distributed among the SDI program elements at the discretion of the Program Manager.

The committee is very concerned by ongoing Soviet efforts to develop expanded anti-ballistic missile capabilities. The most apparent of such Soviet activities is the construction of the large phased array radar in central Siberia, which may constitute a violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. This, together with other Soviet activities, raises serious concerns about the Soviet Union's capability to break out of the ABM Treaty rapidly. Such a breakout would, in the committee's view, have very adverse implications for U.S. national security.

The United States is continuing to abide by all terms of the ABM Treaty. The committee directs that all of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act shall be used in compliance with the obligations of the United States created by the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, and the Protocol thereto, as those obligations may exist at the time the funds are expended. The committee notes that it has been assured that the research associated with the Strategic Defense Initiative will fully conform with all U.S. treaty obligations.

To make certain that the Congress is fully informed about Soviet ABM activities, the committee directs the administration to report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives by February 1, 1985, on Soviet compliance with their commitments under the 1972 ABM Treaty.

SUBMARINE LASER COMMUNICATIONS

The administration requested $25.0 million for continued research and development on submarine laser communications in fiscal year 1985.

This DARPA/Navy program is developing blue-green laser technologies for the purpose of providing secure underwater communications to our submarine fleet. This command, control and communications upgrade will enhance the effectiveness and survivability of U.S. submarines while providing control over a variety of other underwater assets. The committee is aware of recent advances that suggest that a submarine laser communication satellite system can be more effective and affordable than previously expected, and that the technology to develop and deploy such a system may be obtainable sooner than previously expected.

The committee, therefore, recommends that this program be funded fully.

DIRECTOR OF TEST AND EVALUATION

The administration initially requested $50.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development for the Director of Test and Evaluation. In the revised budget, the administration reduced this request to $48.4 million. The justification for this revision was a delay in acquisition of test bed equipment, reduction in contractual support, and omission of one or more foreign weapon evaluations.

This program provides funds for joint testing of developmental and deployed systems to determine capabilities to perform intended missions in joint environments, for independent activities in the direction and supervision of test and evaluation, and for study efforts to improve the 19 DOD ranges and test facilities.

The committee recommends authorization of $47.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for research and development for the Director of Test and Evaluation, a reduction of $3.0 million from the original request and $1.4 million from the revised request.

AUTONOMOUS TERMINAL HOMING

The committee continues to support the exploitation of emerging technologies in order to improve conventional capabilities and raise the nuclear threshold. In this regard, the success of the recently completed DARPA technology effort for autonomous terminal homing shows much promise of meeting the near-zero CEP accuracy requirements of a nonnuclear cruise missile capable of destroying very hard targets. The Department of Defense is therefore directed to transfer this technology program from DARPA to the appropriate service(s) with the objective of meeting an initial operational capability by 1990 or earlier. The committee recommends that $24.2 million be authorized for this purpose, and will entertain a reprograming action if additional funds are deemed necessary to meet the earliest practicable IOC.

TECHNOLOGY BASE AND SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

The committee is concerned over the lack of growth in the Defense technology base over the past 2 years. The fiscal year 1985 request of $3.226 billion for the technology base is lower than both the fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983 levels in real terms and is only 8 percent above the fiscal year 1980 level in real terms. The total Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) budget has increased 88 percent in real terms over the same period, from $13.5 billion in fiscal year 1980 to $34.0 billion in the fiscal year 1985 request.

The committee has reluctantly reduced the technology base program by $28.5 million, less than 1 percent of the request. This is a much smaller reduction than those made in other research and development accounts. The committee would have considerd allocating increased funds for the technology base if the overall budget had allowed. Unfortunately, as a result of congressionally mandated budget reductions, this was not possible.

The technology base programs represent our investment in future defense capabilities. We and our allies lead today in many important basic technology areas: computers and software, optics, signal processing, robotics, artificial intelligence, and materials technology. But this lead could prove fragile, if we do not continue to sustain our science and technology base, particularly in our universities.

In many areas, our lead over the Soviet Union is decreasing, as the Soviet Union has placed great emphasis on long-term research and maintains the largest scientific establishment in the world. In areas such as X-ray lasers and neutral particle beams the Soviets have been at the forefront of basic scientific research. While Soviet support of basic and applied research with defense applications has grown steadily, DOD investment in the technology base dropped by 40 percent from the mid-1960's to mid-1970's and today remains more than 30 percent below the mid-1960's level in real terms.

Of particular concern to the committee is DOD support for university research. The rapid increase in the overall DOD research budget over the past few years has greatly enlarged the demand for high-quality scientists and engineers in our industry. Higher salaries and the more modern scientific equipment available in industry have attracted both faculty and potential graduate students away from the universities. This in turn is making it more difficult for the universities to educate the next generation of scientists and engineers and thereby replenish the pool of scientists and engineers from which DOD draws.

The committee is convinced that DOD must do its share to maintain the excellence of our scientific infrastructure through strong support of university research. DOD support for university research remains well below its pre-Vietnam war levels. The committee has strongly supported the DOD university instrumentation initiative, funded at $30.0 million/year over the past 3 years. This program has been greatly oversubscribed by worthwhile projects and the committee would hope to see it expanded in the future. The committee would be receptive to other DOD initiatives to support our science and engineering infrastructure.

The committee, therefore, requests a report by the Secretary of Defense on DOD activities and plans to support the United States infrastructure for science and engineering education and research.

The report should identify DOD needs, existing activities that should be strengthened, new initiatives which should be undertaken, and should make specific recommendations as to additional legislative authority and appropriations necessary to accomplish these objectives. In defining DOD needs, the report should take into account the trends in allied support for the defense technology base and science and engineering infrastructure. The report should address the role of DOD in education and training of engineers and scientists for technologies used by DOD through (1) the support of university research, including independent research and development, (2) the interaction of defense contractors with the universities, (3) the use of fellowships, internships, and cooperative education, (4) the upgrading of university research instrumentation and facilities, and (5) the maintenance and development of technical skills in DOD laboratories. The report should also address how we, our NATO allies, and Japan could work more effectively together in long term research and maintain our scientific and technical lead over the Soviet Union. The report shall be submitted to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees by March 1, 1985.

TITLE I, PART C—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Summary

The administration requested $80,927 million for the operation and maintenance of the armed forces and the component agencies of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1985. Subsequent to its February request, the administration identified potential revisions to the fiscal year 1985 O&M budget totaling $2,496 million.

The committee recommends authorization of $78,464 million for operation and maintenance in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $2,463 from the February request. Approximately 35 percent of the recommended reduction is tied to financial changes in the price of fuel and in foreign currency. The committee estimates that the recommended level of authorization will provide for approximately 6.5

percent real growth over the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1984.

[Dollars in thousands]

Operation and maintenance	Fiscal year 1985 request (Feb)	Growth over fiscal year 1984	Recommended change to fiscal year 1985 request
Army	$19,486,518	+$2,151,622	−$847,400
Navy	26,248,426	+3,955,498	−614,900
USMC	1,683,069	+119,949	−34,900
Air Force	20,234,500	+2,503,905	−697,700
Defense Agencies	7,338,370	+774,488	−160,900
Army Reserve	715,450	+23,560	−2,300
Navy Reserve	829,531	+193,041	−11,100
Marine Corps Reserve	58,642	+6,293	0
Air Force Reserve	883,461	+92,761	−10,800
Army National Guard	1,404,643	+217,203	−11,100
Air National Guard	1,862,148	+55,548	−51,900
Natl Board Promo of Rifle Practice	914	+5	0
Claims, Defense	177,900	+17,500	−20,000
Court of Military Appeals	3,470	+98	−54
Other O&M		−200,000	
Total	80,927,042	+9,911,471	−2,463,054

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The administration requested approximately $19,487 million for operation and maintenance of the Army in fiscal year 1985. The request provided for 9 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program. Program growth in the request focused on continuing support for modernization, depot maintenance, force structure changes, and base operation support.

In consideration of potential changes to its request, the Department of Defense identified reductions totaling $859M in O&M, Army. The committee made several adjustments to these proposed changes.

The committee recommends $18,639.1 million in O&M, Army, a reduction of $847.4 million from the February request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 6 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization, and to slow the necessary increases in minor construction, maintenance, data processing, and other logistics support.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$17,334.9
Fiscal year 1985 request	19,486.5
Growth over fiscal year 1984	2,151.6

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Fuel	−$29.6	−$29.6
Foreign currency	−309.8	−309.8
Stock fund repricing	−172.8	−172.8
Environmental restoration	−32.0	−75.0
Administration	−20.0	−20.0
Minor construction	−18.0	−18.0
Base operating support	−12.6	−12.6
Support to other nations	−3.0	−3.0
Supply and transportation activities	−84.1	−28.0
Depot maintenance	−113.0	−101.0
Maintenance and logistics support	−29.1	−29.1
Roland deactivation	−42.9	NC
Classified programs		NC
Civilian end strength reduction		−46.8
Recruiting		+8.0
ADEA deactivation		−42.5
Force development initiatives		+34.8
Contract studies and analyses		−2.0
Total of recommended changes		−847.4
Total recommended for authorization		18,639.1

STOCK FUND REPRICING

In consideration of potential revisions to its fiscal year 1985 request the Department of Defense determined that the average prices to be charged Army customers in fiscal year 1985 will decrease 6.4 percent.

The committee therefore concurred with the Department's recommendation of a reduction of $172.8 million.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The Army requested program growth of $103.1 million in fiscal year 1985 for toxic and hazardous waste clean up. The Department of Defense subsequently recommended a reduction of $32 million. The House Armed Services Committee recommended a reduction of $75 million.

The committee believes that, even though the environmental restoration fund is a worthwhile program, growth in this area does not have the same priority as do other O&M programs.

The committee concurs with the House, and recommends a reduction of $75 million from the February request.

SUPPLY AND TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

In consideration of potential revisions to its fiscal year 1985 request the Department of Defense identified six separate reductions in supply and transportation activities totaling $84.1 million.

The committee concurred with financing changes related to the transportation of ammunition (−$5.0 million) further deferral of demilitarization of chemical munitions (−$15.0 million), and a deletion of funding for the Western Area Demilitarization Facility (−$8.0 million).

The committee did not concur with proposed reductions in the care of supplies in storage, industrial preparedness operations, or reductions in the asset capitalization program.

The committee thus recommends a reduction of $28.0 million in supply and transportation activities.

OTHER ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REVISIONS

In consideration of potential revisions to its fiscal year 1985 request the Department of Defense identified several other possible reductions to the Army's O&M program. These included reductions in administration, minor construction, base operating support, depot maintenance, maintenance and logistics support, and support to other nations.

For several years, the committee has resisted reductions in depot maintenance, logistics support, and minor construction. Nevertheless, the committee has concluded that given the considerable reductions called for in the budget process the Congress should not attempt to artificially avoid reductions in major O&M programs.

The committee therefore concurred in the following recommended reductions:

[Dollars in millions]

Administration	−$20.0
Minor construction	−18.0
Base operating support	−12.6
Support to other nations	−3.0
Depot maintenance	−101.0
Maintenance and logistics support	−29.1

The committee did not concur in the recommended force structure changes in air defense involving the Roland missile.

RECRUITING, ADVERTISING, AND EXAMINING

The Army requested $227.6 million for recruiting, advertising, and examining in fiscal year 1985. This represents a real decline of 3.3 percent from the fiscal year 1984 program.

The committee has taken note of the testimony of senior Army officials indicated that an improving economy has slowed the flow of new recruits. In light of this testimony it is clear that the Army's fiscal year 1985 recruiting and advertising request is underfunded. The committee recognizes that increases to this program will not produce immediate results; but they are nevertheless justified given the economic and demographic trends.

The committee therefore recommends $235.6 million for recruiting, advertising, and examining in fiscal year 1985, an increase of $8.0 million above the request.

ARMY DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY (ADEA) AND FORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

The Army requested $42.5 million for operational support of ADEA in fiscal year 1985. This amount included real growth of $7.7 million over the fiscal year 1984 program.

The committee is concerned that ADEA is being transformed from a special activity tied to the High Technology Light Division concept into a permanent and growing activity with a broad charter. Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs that R&D funding under ADEA be transferred to selected commanders of Army divisions.

Concerning the $42.5 million in O&M funding requested to support ADEA in fiscal year 1985 the committee recommends the following:

$8.0 million to be applied towards support for the transition of the 9th ID to a Motorized configuration;

$24.0 million in ADEA programs to be transferred to major commands, schools or centers designated by the Army as appropriate; and

$1.8 million to be applied toward administration of the above transfers.

The committee recommends that the $7.7 million requested for program growth be denied.

The intent of the committee recommendation is to strengthen the Army's schools and centers, and to improve the participation and incentives for force development initiatives at the user level.

POMCUS DIVISION SETS 5 AND 6

The administration requested $58.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for operation and maintenance for the Army for the Prepositioned Material Configured to Units Sets (POMCUS) program for U.S. Division Sets 5 and 6. These divisions sets are to be prepositioned in Belgium and the Netherlands.

It is critically important that the United States follow through with its plans for prepositioning Division Sets 5 and 6. The forward-stationing of four U.S. divisions plus the prepositioning of equipment for an additional six divisions is, by far, the least expensive way to insure a 10-division D-Day force—in line with the U.S. commitment—and the only way to do it in the near term.

The committee recommends authorization of $58.0 million in fiscal year 1985 for operation and maintenance of POMCUS Division Sets 5 and 6.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

The administration requested $26,248.4 million for operation and maintenance of the Navy in fiscal year 1985. The request provided for approximately 10.2 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program. The request reflected increases in ship and aircraft inventories, phased maintenance, the Trident program, and transfers from other appropriations.

In consideration of potential changes to the fiscal year 1985 request, the Department of Defense identified reductions totaling $753.6 million in Navy O&M. The committee recommended $25,633.5 million for Navy O&M, a reduction of $614.9 million from the February request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 8 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program.

The effect of the committee recommendation is to continue full support for ship operations and flying hours, increase the backlog of overhauls to 3 ships (2 LPDs, 1 CGN), and to reduce growth in logistics and support programs. The committee recommendation includes increases for base security and recruiting.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$22,292.1
Fiscal year 1985 request	26,248.4
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+3,955.4

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Minor construction/RPMA	−$58.1	−$58.1
Ship overhauls	−320.4	−190.8
Environmental restoration	−8.9	−8.9
Tactical flying hours	−18.4	NC
Other logistics support	−52.0	−52.0
Travel	−14.0	−14.0
Contract support services	−21.0	−21.0
Factory training	−20.0	−20.0
Stock fund repricing	−62.0	−62.0
Currency	−58.4	−58.4
Fuel	−120.4	−120.4
Waterside security		+8.0
Other base operations		−6.0
Field operations		−25.0
Recruiting		+6.0
Sealift surge		+7.7
Total of recommended changes		−614.9
Total recommended for authorization		25,633.5

ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REVISIONS

In consideration of potential revisions to its fiscal year 1985 request the Department of Defense identified reductions of $753.6 million in Navy O&M programs. Of this amount, 32 percent involved financial adjustments in fuel, stock funds, and foreign currency; and 16 percent involved program reductions in lower priority areas such as factory training, contract support services, travel, minor construction/real property maintenance, and environmental restoration. However, other proposed revisions to Navy O&M are in areas of traditional interest to the committee such as ship overhauls, and other logistics support.

The fiscal year 1985 request provided for 56 overhauls and 2 ships in backlog. A reduction of $320.4 million would reduce the number of overhauls and increase the backlog, by 2 ships. This reduction will also affect the installation of alternations and modifications to shipboard equipment. The committee rejected the proposed deferral of the overhaul of SSBN 640, valued at $129.6 million.

A reduction of $52 million in other logistics support will constrain real growth in activities such as ordnance disposal, engineering design updates, and computer systems upgrades.

The committee remains concerned that reductions have been proposed in areas it has previously attempted to protect. Where the Department of Defense has regular and recurring maintenance requirements the committee has consistently argued against allowing growth in maintenance backlogs. Nevertheless, the Navy's depot maintenance, real property maintenance, and other logistics program count for a large portion of the O&M budget. The committee concluded that given reductions of the magnitude required in the budget process these areas could not be exempted from consideration.

The committee did not concur with the proposed reduction in Navy flying hours nor deferral of an SSBN overhaul, but recommends all other revisions proposed by the Department of Defense in Navy O&M.

WATERSIDE SECURITY

The committee has previously expressed its concern regarding the physical security of waterside naval installations and the need for further efforts in this area. The House recommended additional funds in fiscal year 1985 for pilot projects.

The committee concurs and recommends an increase of $8 million above the request for this purpose.

OTHER BASE OPERATIONS

The Navy request contained $11.3 million in program growth for other base operations. The House reduced the growth to $5.4 million. The committee concurs and recommends a reduction of $6 million in this program.

FIELD OPERATIONS

The request included $56 million in program growth for the Navy's field operations. The House reduced this growth to $31 million over the fiscal year 1984 level. The committee concurs and recommends a reduction of $25 million from the request.

RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING ACTIVITIES

The Navy requested $76.6 million for recruiting and advertising activities in fiscal year 1985. The request provides for no real program growth over fiscal year 1984 levels.

In the execution of the fiscal year 1984 program, the Navy has transferred funds from its advertising program into recruiting in order to meet current expenses. The fiscal year 1985 request reflects a similar shortfall. In addition, the fiscal year 1985 request is insufficient to support a national advertising program for radio or television. Given the Navy's emerging manpower requirements and the more demanding recruiting environment now forecast, the committee believes that increase in this area are are both justified and necessary.

The committee recommends $82.6 million for recruiting and advertising activities in fiscal year 1985, an increase of $6 million above the February request.

SEALIFT SURGE

The administration requested $59.131 million in operation and maintenance for the Navy for sealift surge.

This program provides (1) a surge capability by fast logistics ships (T-AKR's) and ships of the Ready Reserve Force for early loading of deploying units in a contingency; (2) special mission requirements, such as aviation support ships (T-AVB's); and (3) the sealift enhancement features program to enhance the military utility of merchant ships.

The authorization request in fiscal year 1985 for sealift surge is inadequate to keep the four opertional T-AKR's at a high level of readiness in a reduced operating status. An additional $10.0 million is required for this purpose. This requirement is offset, in part, by delays in the T-AVB program which will obviate the need for $2.336 million requested for T-AVB operations.

The committee, therefore, recommends authorization in fiscal year 1985 of $66.795 million in operation and maintenance for sealift surge, an increase of $7.664 million to the administration's request.

POSEIDON SSBN

The committee is concerned that maintaining Poseidon SSBN operational force levels may not enjoy sufficient priority. This is evidenced by recent changes in SSBN overhaul planning, including the deferral of the planned overhaul of U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin* (SSBN-640) as part of the fiscal year 1985 budget reduction package. The committee directs that no irreversible action be taken with regard to SSBNs that would result in their removal from strategic service without prior notification to the Armed Services Committee indicating the reason for such action, and the effect on our military capability, arms control posture and the strategic balance.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

The administration request contained $1,683.1 million for operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps in fiscal year 1985. The request provided for approximately 3.7 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program.

In considering potential revisions to its fiscal year 1985 budget request, the Department of Defense identified several changes to the Marine Corps O&M program valued at $34.9 million.

Reductions were proposed for commercial activities ($9 million), Camouflage Screens ($8.2 million), and contract support services ($1 million). Adjustments were also identified based on financial changes in fuel and foreign currency. While a reduction in camouflage screens will delay their delivery to some units, the committee determined that these proposed reductions would have no major impact on Marine Corps operations during fiscal year 1985.

The committee therefore concurred with the proposed revisions and recommends $1,648.2 million for O&M, Marine Corps in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $34.9 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

	Millions
Fiscal year appropriated	$1,563.1
Fiscal year 1985 request	1,683.0
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+119.1

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Commercial activities	−$9.0	−$9.0
Camouflage screens	−8.2	−8.2
Contract supply services	−1.0	−1.0
Currency	−14.8	−14.8
Fuel	−1.9	−1.9
Total of recommended changes		−34.9
Total recommended for authorization		1,648.2

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

The administration requested $20,234.5 million for operation and maintenance of the Air Force in fiscal year 1985. The request provided for approximately 10 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program. Growth in the request was focused on support for strategic systems, tactical force structure and flying hours, space, and communications.

In consideration of potential changes to its fiscal year 1985 request the Department of Defense identified reductions totaling $613.3 million in Air Force O&M. The committee recommended $19,536.8 million for this program, a reduction of $697.7 million from the February request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 7.5 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program.

The effect of the committee recommendation is to continue full support for the flying hour and depot maintenance programs, and to slow growth in logistics support, real property maintenance, and improvements to test ranges. It also reduces the active inventory of F-4E aircraft by one squadron, accelerating their transfer to the Air National Guard.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$17,703.6
Fiscal year 1985 request	1,683.0
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+2,503.91

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Military end strength	–$1.0	–$1.0
Civilian personnel	–93.4	–93.4
Environmental restoration	–39.0	–39.0
MAC commercial augmentation	–29.0	–29.0
Medical war readiness	–.2	–.2
Family support centers	–1.2	–1.2
Flying hours	–47.0	NC
RPMA	–65.0	–65.0
Inter service automated message processing	–21.0	–21.0
EMP rephase/EMP hardening	–1.6	–1.6
F–4 force structure changes	–14.0	–14.0
Defensewide mission support	–15.5	–15.5
Shuttle operations and planning complex	–5.0	–5.0
HH–60 support	–.5	–.5
2nd destination transportation	–4.0	–4.0
CADIN Pinetree	–11.0	–11.0
Currency	–94.2	–94.2
Fuel	–173.7	–173.7
Classified programs		–5.2
Civilian end strength reduction		–109.2
CONUS OTH–B radar		–1.9
Precision location strike system		–2.3
Air base ground defense		–5.8
Contract studies and analyses		–4.0
Total of recommended changes		–697.7
Total recommended for authorization		19,536.8

ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REVISIONS

The Department of Defense proposed numerous reductions in Air Force O&M totaling $616.3 million.

The committee concurred with all proposed reductions with the exception of the proposed reduction in flying hours. The committee recommended the flying hour program at the levels contained in the February request.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Consistent with the recommendations contained in the manpower section of this report, the committee recommends a corresponding reduction in Air Force O&M of $109.2 million.

OTHER REVISIONS

The administrations proposed budget revisions contained recommendation for rephasing of the West Coast OTH–B Program, and restructuring of the precision location strike system program.

The committee recommends that the real growth associated with O&M support for these programs in fiscal year 1985 be denied. The corresponding reduction in Air Force O&M amounts to $4.2 million.

AIR BASE GROUND DEFENSE

The administration request contained $5.8 million in Air Force O&M associated with air base ground defense.

Consistent with action recommended elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends that these funds be denied.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

The administration request contained $7,338.3 million for operation and maintenance of the Defense Agencies in fiscal year 1985. The request provided for approximately 6.4 percent real growth over the fiscal year 1984 program.

In consideration of potential changes to its request the Department of Defense identified $119.8 million in O&M reductions within the Defense Agencies. The committee concurred with all the reductions identified by the Department of Defense. Consistent with other congressional action, the committee made further adjustments in CHAMPUS, civilian personnel, and classified programs, and denied the amended request for the JCS special fund.

The committee thus recommends $7,177.5 million for O&M, Defense Agencies in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $160.9 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$6,563.9
Fiscal year 1985 request	7,338.3
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+774.4

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Defense Mapping Agency	−$10.4	−$10.4
American Forces Information Service	−1.3	−1.3
CHAMPUS	−37.4	+2.6
Medical Information System	−1.8	−1.8
OSD contracts, travel	−2.0	−6.0
Washington Headquarters Services ADP contracts	−1.9	−1.9
DODDS foreign currency	−17.3	−17.3
Currency	−2.7	−2.7
Defense Nuclear Agency Travel	−1.9	−1.9
OJCS—JCS Special Fund	−6.8	−50.0
OJCS—Management HQ	−1.4	−1.4
OJCS—JCS exercises	−1.0	−1.0
Defense Communications Agency	−4.8	−4.8
Defense Logistics Agency	−24.2	−24.2
DLA currency	−2.8	−2.8
Defense Investigative Service	−.5	−.5
Uniformed Services University of the Health Services	−.5	−.5
DOD Inspector General	−.5	−.5
Defense Audiovisual Agency	−.5	−.5
Civilian end strength reduction	—	−13.0
Classified programs	—	−21.0
Total of recommended changes	—	−160.9
Total recommended for authorization	—	7,177.5

CHAMPUS

The request contained $1,437 million for the CHAMPUS program in fiscal year 1985.

The administration identified management initiatives equivalent to a $37.4 million reduction in its May revisions.

The committee concurred in this reduction.

The committee has recommended other changes in the manpower section of this report which will increase the costs of the CHAMPUS program by approximately $40 million in fiscal year 1985.

The committee therefore recommends $1,439.6 million for CHAMPUS in fiscal year 1985, a net increase of $2.6 million above the February request.

JCS SPECIAL FUND

The request contained $50 million for a special fund to be used by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the purpose of meeting the unprogramed, urgent, and near-term readiness requirements of the Unified Commands.

The need for such a fund is based upon the financial dependence of the Unified Commands on service components to meet the unprogramed requirements of the CINCs, and on the difficulties associated with the reprograming and supplemental processes. Basically, the Department of Defense is seeking authority to overcome these two bureaucratic deficiencies which may adversely impact the readiness fo the Unified Commands.

Fiscal year 1985 is the third consecutive year in which funds have been requested for this (or similar) purposes. The Congress has denied the previous two requests. The most fundamental concerns of the Congress have been that direct appropriations were being requested without the certain knowledge of how they would be used, and that it is difficult to justify the funding of "contingencies" within a budget where some established requirements will go unmet.

The committee shares these concerns and is not yet convinced of the need for direct appropriations. However, the committee is satisfied that the Unified Commands are too dependent on the independent programmatic and financial decisions of their service components, and that in some cases such decisions may be contrary to the interests of the Unified Commands. The committee believes that Congress should recognize this problem and respond this year in a positive way.

The committee recommends that the request for $50 million in direct appropriations be denied, but that the Secretary of Defense be provided with the authority to make available O&M funds to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet the urgent, unprogramed, and one-time readiness requirements of the Unified Commands.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to provide the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate an interim report by May 1, 1985 and a final report not later than December 1, 1985 which outlines and describes the circumstances under which this authority has been exercised during fiscal year 1985.

The committee believes that the practical exercise of this authority will provide the most reliable indication of the need for separate and distinct appropriations.

In the event that the frequency and scope of unprogramed CINC requirements exceeds those levels which it might appear prudent to grant under this authorization, the committee recommends that the Department of Defense consider the establishment of a revolving fund to meet such contingencies.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

The request contained $715.4 million for operation and maintenance of the Army Reserve in fiscal year 1985.

The committee concurred with the minor adjustments proposed in the May budget revisions and recommends $713.1 million for O&M, Army Reserve, a reduction of $2.3 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$691.9
Fiscal year 1985 request	715.4
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+23.6

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Paid drill strength	-$1.2	-$1.2
Fuel	-1.1	-1.1
Total of recommended changes		-2.3
Total recommended for authorization		[1] 713.2

[1] Numbers may not add due to rounding.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

The request contained $829.5 million for operation and maintenance of the Navy Reserve in fiscal year 1985.

The committee concurred with the minor adjustments proposed in the May budget revisions and recommends $818.4 million for O&M, Navy Reserve in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $11.1 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$636.4
Fiscal year 1985 request	829.5
Growth over fiscal year 1984	193.0

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Minor construction/RPMA	–$4.0	–$4.0
Fuel	–7.1	–7.1
Total of recommended changes		–11.1
Total recommended for authorization		818.4

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The committee recommends the requested amount of $58.6 million for operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps Reserve in fiscal year 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$52.3
Fiscal year 1985 request	58.7
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+6.2

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
None		

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

The request contained $883.4 million for operation and maintenance of the Air Force reserve in fiscal year 1985.

The committee concurred with the proposed reductions identified in the May budget revisions. The committee recommends $872.7 million for O&M, USAF Reserve in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $10.8 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$790.7
Fiscal year 1985 request	883.5
Growth over fiscal year 1984	92.8

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
Civilian personnel	–$4.0	–$4.0
Fuel	–6.8	–6.8
Total of recommended changes		–10.8
Total recommended for authorization		872.7

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The request contained $1,404.7 million for operation and maintenance of the Army National Guard in fiscal year 1985.

The committee concurred with the proposed adjustments for fuel and paid drill strength contained in the May budget revisions. However, the committee did not concur with the proposed deactivation of the Army's only Roland air defense unit.

The committee therefore recommends $1,393.5 million for O&M, ARNG in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $11.1 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$1,187.4
Fiscal year 1985 request	1,404.7
Growth over fiscal year 1984	+217.2

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Commmittee recommendation
Paid drill strength	−$7.8	−$7.8
Roland deactivation	−5.1	NC
Fuel	−3.3	−3.3
Total of recommended charges		−11.1
Total recommended for authorization		1,393.6

ROLAND

The request contained $42.2 million in O&M, Army for operation of the Roland air defense missile system. The request also contained $4.2 million for this purpose in O&M, Army National Guard.

The Army National Guard was allocated this equipment in 1982 to solve the problems with personnel rotation and training which would have arisen if the limited number of Roland fire units, which had been produced prior to cancellation of the Roland procurement in 1981, had been fielded in the Active Army and to give the Guard a modern system with a high visibility mission.

In consideration of potential revisions to its fiscal year 1985 request the Department of Defense proposed that the activation of Roland National Guard units be terminated. The rationale provided by the Department of Defense stated that National Guard units would be able to operate more effectively if they were operating with systems comparable to those used by the active Army.

The committee recognizes the need to improve the equipment available to National Guard air defense battalions which are currently armed with Korean War vintage M-42 Dusters, and elsewhere in the bill has allocated additional funding for purchase of 12 Chaparral fire units for Guard modernization.

The National Guard's Roland battalion is currently the Army's most deployable and most capable short range air defense unit. For this reason the committee supports the continued deployment of the Roland missile system in the Army National Guard.

It is also the committee's view that because of the additional expense incurred in operating a one of a kind unit such as Roland the Army should eventually consider other options for this system. However, a phasing out of Roland should not be initiated until the majority of National Guard air defense battalions have completed planned modernization and the remainder are programed to do so.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The request contained $1,862.1 million for operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1985.

In its May budget revisions the Department of Defense identified potential reductions totaling $51.9 million. Of this amount, $21.6 million was based on a fuel adjustment. The remaining reduction of $30.3 million was associated with the decision to provide the ANG with C-5A aircraft in lieu of the commercial 747 aircraft whose procurement was provided for fiscal year 1983. Funds for the 747 aircraft are not on contract.

The committee concurred with both revisions and recommends $1,810.2 million for O&M, ANG in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $51.9 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

	Millions
Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	$1,806.7
Fiscal year 1985 request	1,862.1
Growth over fiscal year 1984	55.5

[Dollars in millions]

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
C-19 squadron	-$30.3	-$30.3
Fuel	-21.6	-21.6
Total of recommended changes		-51.9
Total recommended for authorization		1,810.2

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, OTHER BUDGET ACTIVITIES

The request contained $182.3 million for other O&M purposes in fiscal year 1985 including the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the Court of Military Appeals, and Defense Claims.

The committee concurred with the adjustments proposed in the May budget revisions and recommends $162.2 million for these purposes in fiscal year 1985, a reduction of $20.1 million from the February request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, OTHER BUDGET ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1984 appropriated	Fiscal year 1985 request	Change
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice	$909	$914	$5
Claims, Defense	160,400	177,900	17,500
Court of Military Appeals	3,372	3,470	98

Proposed adjustments	DOD proposed reductions to original request	Committee recommendation
NBPRP	0	0
Claims, Defense	−$20,000	−$20,000
Court of Military Appeals	−54	−54

OTHER PROVISIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY RAISES, FUEL COSTS AND INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS

The committee recommends approval of the legislative provision requested to authorize additional appropriations as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement and other employee benefits authorized by law for DOD civilian employees, and unbudgeted increases in costs associated with inflation and the price of fuel.

STOCK FUNDS

The committee is recommending authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense working capital funds for the first time in fiscal year 1985. Because of the relationship of the working capital funds to the operations and maintenance account, the Subcommittee on Preparedness has been assigned jurisdiction over these funds.

The stock funds are revolving working capital funds which finance the "Supply Pipeline" of low-cost, demand-supported consumable items. Examples of the items financed by the stock funds are repair parts such as spark plugs and tires, other consumables such as clothing and housekeeping supplies, and minor end items (less than $3,000) such as furniture and lawnmowers.

Stock Fund assets consist of two elements: an inventory of supplies and cash on hand. Customers are issued supplies using their appropriate funds. Appropriated funds received are added to the stock fund cash, which is then used to purchase replacements supplies from commercial sources.

The stock funds are not considered an appropriated fund. Obligation authority is apportioned by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget. Congressional appropriation is required, however, to obtain additional funds to augment stock cash as well as funds to purchase stock fund war reserve materials.

Adequate funding for the stock funds is important to the maintenance of the military capability of U.S. forces. The absence of the bits and pieces procured by the stock funds, while relatively low in unit cost can cause a shortfall which in turn can cause a weapon system to be ineffective, just as can a shortage of an expensive component purchased through the procurement accounts. Wholesale supply availability which has generally improved in recent years and the number of wholesale requisitions backordered which has generally declined in recent years are an important indicators of the stock fund's contribution to readiness.

The funding history of the stock funds and the committee recommendations is reflected below:

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1983	Fiscal year 1984	Fiscal year 1985	DOD proposed revision	Committee recommendation
USA	$221.1	$388.6	$366.4		$366.4
USN	354.7	632.9	563.9	$473.0	473.0
USMC	11.8	20.8	34.9		34.9
USAF	161.6	1,288.7	666.1	631.8	631.8
DOD	160.5	43.6	130.7		130.7

On May 3, 1985 as a part of the administration's budget reduction effort, the Department of Defense identified reductions in the request for funds for the stock funds as noted above. The committee concurs with these proposed adjustments. In the case of the Navy, the reduction of $90.9 million is consistent with end item reduction and overall operations. In the case of the Air Force the reduction of $17.0 million is possible due to recent procurement initiatives which will enable the Air Force to acquire the required items at more favorable prices.

The authorization recommended by the committee permits substantial growth for the Marine Corps ($14.0 million) and the Department of Defense ($87 million) accounts. The apparent reduction in the remaining accounts will be compensated for, in part, by outlays in fiscal year 1985 from prior year appropriations. For example, USAF fiscal year 1985 outlays were estimated to be $835.8 million.

TITLE I, PART D—PERSONNEL

SUBPART 1—Active Forces

BACKGROUND ON ACTIVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

Since fiscal year 1972, Congress has been required by law (Public Law 91-441) to annually authorize the active duty end strength of each component of the armed forces. This requirement enhances congressional oversight of military manpower requirements.

This year the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel held four hearings to receive testimony on the Department of Defense manpower request for fiscal year 1985. Based on those hearings, the Military Manpower Requirements Report, and other information, the committee has conducted a thorough analysis of fiscal year 1985 manpower requirements.

FORCE STRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS

The force structure for fiscal year 1985 continues to be based on the Total Force Policy, which recognizes that all active and reserve units contribute to success in wartime. Active duty units comprise that portion of the total force needed for a contingency not involving mobilization, for immediate deployment in a major war before selected reserve units can be deployed, and for forward deployment in peacetime as a deterrent against conflict.

The following table summarizes the major force structure elements that existed at the end of fiscal year 1983 and that are planned for the end of fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FORCE STRUCTURE ELEMENTS

	Fiscal year—		
	1983	1984	1985
Strategic:			
ICBM's	1,042	1,031	1,023
Bombers (PAA) [1]	297	297	298
Tankers (KC-135) (PAA): [1]			
Active	487	487	487
Guard/Reserve	128	128	128
Interceptor squadrons:			
Active	5	5	5
Guard/Reserve	10	11	11
Ballistic missile submarines (SSBN's)	34	35	37
Tactical/mobility:			
Land forces:			
Army Divisions:			
Active	16	16	17
Guard	8	[2] 9	9
Army separate brigade/regiments:			
Active [3]	9	9	9
Guard/Reserve [4]	29	26	26
Marine Corps Divisions:			
Active	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1
Tactical Air Forces: [5]			
Air force squadrons:			
Active	110	109	111
Guard/Reserve [6]	59	58	57

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FORCE STRUCTURE ELEMENTS—Continued

	Fiscal year—		
	1983	1984	1985
Navy squadrons:			
Active	83	88	90
Reserve	16	16	16
Marine Corps Squadrons:			
Active	30	30	30
Reserve	10	10	10
Naval Forces:			
Carriers (active only)	13	13	13
Attack Submarines (active only)	98	99	100
Surface combatants:			
Active	186	193	199
Reserve	9	10	12
Amphibious assault ships:			
Active	61	59	59
Reserve	2	2	2
Patrol ships (active only)	6	6	6
ASW and FAD aircraft squadrons:			
Active	54	55	57
Reserve	17	17	17
Mobility forces:			
Airlift squadrons:			
Active	34	34	34
Guard/Reserve [7]	53	53	53
Sealift ships:			
Nucleus fleet [8]	89	95	105
Chartered fleet	22	20	20

[1] Primary aircraft authorized (PAA).

[2] The additional division (35th Infantry Division) will consist only of a Division Headquarters in fiscal year 1984.

[3] Includes one Air Cavalry Combat Brigade.

[4] Includes five Reserve Component brigades that roundout active divisions, one infantry brigade for school support upon mobilization and five threater defense brigades. Three brigades which form the 35th Infantry Division (ARNG) are excluded.

[5] Includes tactical fighter, tactical reconnaissance, special operations, airborne command posts, tanker/cargo (KC-10), and electronic combat squadrons.

[6] Includes 2 KC-10 Reserve Associate Squadrons as of fiscal year 1984.

[7] Includes 17 strategic airlift Reserve Associate Squadrons, but excludes rescue, weather, and C9s.

[8] Includes naval fleet auxiliary force, mobility enhancement, nucleus fleet and scientific support vessels operated by the Military Sealift Command.

To man the active units in the force structure, the Department of Defense originally requested a total active duty end strength of 2,165,800 for fiscal year 1985. In its revision to its original budget request, the Department reduced its active duty end strength request by 7,000 to 2,158,800.

The following table displays the distribution of the Department's original manpower request among major defense functions:

ORIGINAL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT MILITARY MANPOWER REQUEST, FISCAL YEAR 1985

[End strengths in thousands]

	Fiscal year—				
	1964 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 plan	1985 original request
Strategic	222	94	95	94	94
Tactical/mobility	1,060	975	987	1,017	1,029
Land forces	605	559	554	570	571
Tactical forces	145	188	191	199	204

ORIGINAL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT MILITARY MANPOWER REQUEST, FISCAL YEAR 1985—Continued

[End strengths in thousands]

	Fiscal year—				
	1964 actual	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 plan	1985 original request
Naval forces	255	189	203	208	214
Mobility forces	55	39	40	40	40
Auxiliary activities	187	96	104	108	110
Intelligence	76	32	33	34	35
Communications	43	32	37	39	40
Research and development	49	22	23	24	24
Geophysical activities	18	10	10	10	11
Support activities	1,218	944	938	945	954
Base operating support	433	307	298	296	301
Medical support	84	44	43	45	46
Personnel support	18	32	32	32	32
Training [1]	519	455	455	463	467
Central logistics	33	19	21	21	22
Centralized support activities	48	45	46	46	45
Management headquarters	83	40	40	39	39
Federal agency support	2	3	3	3	3
Total Defense Department [2]	2,687	2,109	2,123	2,136	2,166
Army	973	780	780	780	781
Navy	667	553	558	565	575
Marine Corps	190	192	194	197	200
Air Force	857	583	592	595	610

[1] Includes training staff, trainees, students, and transients.

[2] Subtotals may not add to totals due to rounding and undermanning.

ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTHS

The committee recommends authorization of an active duty end strength of 2,155,540. The committee recommendation on the active duty end strength for each military Service is shown below:

ACTIVE DUTY MANPOWER

[End strengths]

	Fiscal year—				Change from revised request
	1984 authorized level	1985 original request	1985 revised request	1985 committee recommendation	
Army	780,000	780,800	780,800	780,800	0
Navy	564,800	575,300	575,300	572,800	−2,500
Marine Corps	196,600	199,500	199,500	199,000	−500
Air Force	594,500	610,200	603,200	602,940	−260
Total	2,135,900	2,165,800	2,158,800	2,155,540	−3,260

Except in two specific areas, the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force may decide for themselves how to carry out the committee's reductions to their manpower requests. First, the committee expects the Navy to provide the 750 billets it had requested for fiscal year 1985 for the ninth active duty Naval Mobile Construction Battalion (NMCB No. 7). Second, the 260 spaces deleted from the revised Air Force request represent those personnel who would be devoted to a substantial program of air base ground defense. In Title I, Part C, Operation and Maintenance, the committee has explained its reasons for denying the manpower and other resources requested for this program.

SEC. 122, QUALITY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The quality of personnel enlisting in the armed services is measured by the percentage that have graduated from high school and by their scores on the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT). Research shows that possession of a high school diploma is a strong indication that a new recruit will successfully complete obligated military service. This same research also suggests a strong correlation between an individual's AFQT scores and his or her subsequent on-the-job performance.

In response to the relatively high numbers of individuals with low AFQT scores and without high school diplomas entering the Services in fiscal year 1979 and fiscal year 1980, Congress enacted quality constraints on the military Services' recruiting programs beginning in fiscal year 1981. Permanent law, section 520 of title 10, United States Code, limits the number of accessions in each Service who score in AFQT category IV to 20 percent in fiscal year 1983 and subsequent years. In addition, there is also a requirement that at least 65 percent of Army male non-prior service recruits must be high school graduates in fiscal year 1984.

The committee bill includes a section extending through fiscal year 1985 the requirement that at least 65 percent of Army non-prior service recruits must be high school graduates.

In recent years, the recruiting achievements of the military Services have been noteworthy. In fiscal year 1983, each of the military Services met or exceeded its overall recruiting objectives. In terms of quality, 91 percent of all DOD recruits had a high school diploma, and 8 percent of DOD recruits scored in AFQT category IV. For the Army, 86 percent of the male non-prior service recruits were high school graduates, and 12 percent of all Army recruits scored in AFQT category IV.

This success has continued in fiscal year 1984. The first quarter recruiting results indicate that 94 percent of all new DOD recruits had a high school diploma and 6 percent scored in AFQT category IV. For the Army, 89 percent of the male non-prior service recruits were high school graduates, and 11 percent of all Army recruits scored in AFQT category IV.

However, it is not clear how long the military Services will be able to sustain the current recruiting momentum. As the economy improves and the unemployment rate drops, the Services will face increasing competition for 18–21 year olds. The Services also must deal with the demographic reality that the size of the 18–21 year old youth population will decrease by approximately 15 percent between fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1992. Earlier this year, General John Wickham, the Army Chief of Staff, testified that the

Army had experienced a 22 percent decline in the first quarter of fiscal year 1984 compared to last year in the number of young people coming into Army recruiting stations to take the military entrance exams. General Wickham suggested that this 22 percent reduction "may be a harbinger of an upturn in the employment opportunities" for young people.

Eleven years ago, in reporting out the fiscal year 1974 Defense Authorization bill, this committee directed the Department of Defense to analyze the manpower quality requirements of each of the military Services. In response, the Department of Defense submitted a report to the committee entitled "Defense Manpower Quality Requirements." In this report, the Defense Department set forth manpower quality ranges by occupational group for each military Service.

In light of the recent past recruiting success, the recruiting challenges facing the Services in the next few years, and the qualitative and quantitative changes in new weapon systems entering the Services' inventories, the committee believes it is appropriate for the military to review its manpower quality requirements again. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services by March 1, 1985, a report on the current quality of each Services' enlisted force; the projected quality requirements for enlisted personnel in each Service over the next 5 years; and the ability of each Service to meet these quality goals over the next 5 years. This report should:

(1) describe the quality of the current enlisted force in terms of educational level, Armed Forces Qualification Test category, and any other criteria deemed appropriate;

(2) outline the manpower requirements in terms of quality standards needed to man the enlisted force in each of the military Services over the next 5 years, with a discussion of the methodology used to establish these requirements. This methodology should be based on what the military Services need to man their forces, and not based on projections of supply and demand;

(3) set forth the recruiting and retention levels necessary over the next 5 years to sustain the levels of quality established by the requirements developed in each of the military Services; and

(4) outline the changes, if any, to current military compensation policies over the next 5 years necessary to achieve and maintain the manpower quality requirements established by each of the military Services.

This report will provide the Congress with a benchmark against which to judge the military Services' manpower programs over the next 5 years.

Subpart 2—Reserve Forces

BACKGROUND ON RESERVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

Public Law 90-168 requires Congress to annually authorize the average minimum personnel strengths of the Selected Reserves (reservists organized in units) of each reserve component of the armed forces. Unlike actual requirements, the average minimum strengths specified for the Selected Reserves simply represent levels which can be expected to be achieved based on projected recruiting and retention.

SELECTED RESERVE AVERAGE STRENGTHS

The committee recommends modest reductions in the requested average strength levels for Selected Reserve manpower in the reserve components. The largest reductions have been made in the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. In those two components, the committee agreed to the reductions in paid drill strength and full-time reserve manning proposed by the Department of Defense in its revision of its original budget request. (Although full-time reservists are separately authorized in section 127, they are also included within the average strengths of the reserve components in which they are serving.) The committee then made further reductions in full-time manning which, in turn, result in average strength reductions.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

SELECTED RESERVE PERSONNEL

[Average strengths in thousands]

	Fiscal year—				Change from revised request
	1984 authorized levels	1985 original request	1985 revised request	1985 committee recommendation	
Army National Guard	425.0	440.1	435.75	435.25	−0.5
Army Reserve	273.7	288.4	285.9	285.6	−.3
Naval Reserve	112.6	124.2	124.2	124.1	−.1
Marine Corps Reserve	40.3	44.3	44.3	44.3	0
Air National Guard	103.4	106.2	105.498	105.438	−.06
Air Force Reserve	68.6	72.9	72.9	72.9	0
Coast Guard Reserve	12.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	0
Total	1,035.6	1,088.6	1,081.048	1,080.088	−.96

FULL-TIME RESERVE END STRENGTHS

Full-time reserve personnel serve on full-time active duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training reserve personnel.

The committee recommends that the original request for full-time reserve personnel be reduced by 10,000 personnel. In making this recommendation, the committee accepted the Defense Department proposal to reduce its original request by 8,079. In order to achieve additional budgetary savings in a fast-growing program, the committee then further reduced the full-time manning request by 1,921.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

FULL-TIME RESERVE MANPOWER

[End strengths]

	Fiscal year—				Change from revised request
	1984 authorized levels	1985 original request	1985 revised request	1984 committee recommendation	
Army National Guard	18,194	26,583	21,583	20,583	−1,000
Army Reserve	9,914	15,027	12,027	11,427	−600
Naval Reserve	13,846	15,410	15,410	15,210	−200
Marine Corps Reserve	801	1,129	1,129	1,129	0
Air National Guard	5,915	7,224	7,145	7,024	−121
Air Force Reserve	517	623	623	623	0
Total	49,187	65,996	57,917	55,996	−1,921

The committee also recommends approval of the requested increase in the number of senior officer and enlisted personnel who may be on active duty in support of the reserve components.

SEC. 129, CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL SERVING IN FULL-TIME DUTY STATUS

In the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1980 (Public Law 96–107), the Congress created a new authorization category for personnel serving in full-time duty status in support of the Reserves and National Guard.

Following the creation of that status, confusion arose about whether National Guard personnel serving in that status remained under the control of State authorities. Initial steps to clarify this issue were taken in the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984 (Public Law 98–94). To remove any possible misunderstanding that National Guard personnel serving in this status remain subject to State control, the committee recommends additional technical and conforming amendments to titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code.

SUBPART 3—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

BACKGROUND ON CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATION

Congress is required to authorize the civilian personnel end strengths requested by the Department of Defense. This requirement affords the Congress the opportunity to oversee the entire defense manpower program and the interrelationship of each component in the Total Force structure.

CATEGORIES OF CIVILIANS

The civilian end strength figures authorized by Congress represent direct and indirect hire employees, both permanent and temporary, including full-time, part-time and intermittent employees paid from appropriated funds, who are employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense. Indirect hire employees are hired by the host nation in support of U.S. forces stationed abroad. There are estimated to be approximately

85,400 such employees in fiscal year 1985. The following categories of civilian employees are excluded from the strengths recommended:

(1) Employees performing civilian functions administered by the Department of Defense, the largest of which is the Corps of Engineers Civil Works activities. For fiscal year 1985, the end strength for this function is approximately 33,000.

(2) Employment in special employment programs for students and disadvantaged youths, such as the stay-in-school campaign and the temporary summer aid program. The end strength for this program is approximately 8,500.

(3) Employees of the National Security Agency who are excluded because employment statistics are classified information.

(4) Employees paid from nonappropriated funds are not included. The approximate number of such employees is 222,000 for fiscal year 1985.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

The Department of Defense has requested a civilian manpower end strength of 1,084,836. This request represents an increase of 28,636 from the level authorized for fiscal year 1984 and an increase of 6,532 from the current estimate of the fiscal year 1984 end strength.

The following table displays the Defense Department request for civilian personnel by major mission categories:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CIVILIAN MANPOWER REQUEST, FISCAL YEAR 1985

[Direct and indirect hire end strengths in thousands]

	Fiscal year—				
	1964 actual [1]	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 plan	1985 request
Strategic	15	11	11	11	11
Tactical/mobility	67	60	60	62	63
Land forces	30	23	22	24	25
Tactical Air Forces	7	16	17	17	16
Naval forces	(2)	1	1	1	1
Mobility forces	29	20	20	21	21
Auxiliary activities	123	92	96	97	96
Intelligence	11	7	8	9	8
Communications	14	11	11	12	12
Research and development	87	64	67	66	64
Geophysical activities	12	10	11	11	11
Support activities	971	865	898	907	914
Base operating support	357	347	353	351	350
Medical support	32	22	22	22	23
Personnel support	6	21	23	25	25
Training	25	26	27	29	30
Central logistics	451	353	378	385	390
Centralized support activities	34	58	58	61	62
Management headquarters	65	37	36	34	34
Total Defense Department [3]	1,175	1,028	1,065	1,078	1,085

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CIVILIAN MANPOWER REQUEST, FISCAL YEAR 1985—CONTINUED

[Direct and indirect hire end strengths in thousands]

	Fiscal year—				
	1964 actual [1]	1982 actual	1983 actual	1984 plan	1985 request
Army	452	378	391	400	402
Navy	328	299	318	318	318
Marine Corps	19	20	21	21	22
Air Force	338	248	251	249	254
Defense agencies	38	82	83	89	90

[1] Includes civilian reserve technicians not on the Federal payroll in 1964.
[2] Under 500 personnel.
[3] Subtotals may not add to totals due to rounding.

CIVILIAN END STRENGTHS

The committee recommends authorization of a civilian end strength of 1,078,223 for fiscal year 1985. For each of the Services and the Defense agencies, this level represents either the lower of the planned level for fiscal year 1984 or the requested level for fiscal year 1985.

The committee's recommendation for civilian personnel is summarized in the following table:

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

[End strengths in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1984		Fiscal year 1985		Change from request
	Authorized level	Current estimate	Request	Committee recommendation	
Army		400.0	401.8		−1.8
Navy/Marine Corps		339.6	339.6		0
Air Force		249.4	253.6		−4.2
Defense agencies		89.3	89.8		−.6
Total [1]	1,056.2	1,078.3	1,084.8	1,078.2	−6.6

[1] Subtotals may not add to totals due to rounding.

Although the end strength recommended by the committee is 6,613 below the Defense Department's request, it still allows substantial growth over the civilian end strength level authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1984. In addition, the committee has proposed that the Secretary of Defense retain his authority to administratively increase the authorized end strength by up to 2 percent.

The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to fill the civilian spaces requested for enhanced spare parts management within the end strength maintained by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985.

SEC. 132, EXCLUSION OF INDUSTRIALLY FUNDED PERSONNEL FROM CIVILIAN PERSONNEL CEILINGS

The fiscal year 1983 Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 97-377) and the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98-94) effectively excluded civilians employed in industrially-funded activities from the end strength level authorized by Congress. The purpose of the exclusion was to permit Congress to assess the effectiveness of determining industrial fund employment by funded workload rather than by a civilian personnel ceiling.

The committee continues to believe that excluding industrially-funded personnel from an end strength constraint holds promise for improving personnel management. Therefore, the committee recommends that those civilians employed in industrial fund activities at the end of fiscal year 1984 in excess of those employed in such activities on September 30, 1982, not be counted against any statutory or administrative employment ceiling.

SUBPART 4—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

BACKGROUND ON MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS AUTHORIZATION

Public Law 92-436 requires Congress to annually authorize average military training student loads. Training loads represent the average number of military personnel attending formal military training courses on any given day during the year. These loads do not include training conducted in the field or in combat units where personnel train as crews or units. Included are the following types of training:

(1) Recruit training includes all basic initial enlisted training for all Services for both active and reserve components. In all Services, it represents an introduction of the new enlisted man or woman into military life.

(2) Officer acquisition training includes training programs through which officers are procured, such as the Service Military Academies, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Officer Candidate Schools and enlisted commissioning programs.

(3) Specialized training provides both officer and enlisted personnel with skills and knowledge necessary to perform specific jobs or to operate or maintain specific pieces of equipment.

(4) The Army's One Station Unit Training (OSUT) program combines recruit training and initial skill training for certain skills into a single continuous course.

(5) Flight training provides the basic undergraduate flying skills for pilots, navigators and naval flight officers. This category does not include the major formal advance combat training programs which are beyond the scope of this authorization since they are conducted by and for operational units. However, some flight-related skills, such as those of the Air Force navigator, bombardier, and electronic warfare officer, are included.

(6) Professional training includes military education, graduate education, degree completion education and professional development courses not leading to a degree. This training is accomplished at both military and civilian institutions and includes: Senior service schools, staff colleges, advanced degree programs, Department

of Defense schools such as the defense systems management school and enlisted leadership training.

MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS AUTHORIZATION

The committee recommends approval of the military training student loads requested by the Department of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense shall adjust these training loads for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force components so that they are consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in other parts of this bill.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS, FISCAL YEAR 1985, BY COMPONENT AND MAJOR TRAINING CATEGORY

	Recruit training	One-station unit training	Officer acquisition training	Specialized skill training	Flight training	Professional development education	Total
Active Forces:							
Army	13,472	12,673	4,733	41,819	1,237	3,006	76,940
Navy	14,528		6,979	43,926	1,663	2,020	69,116
Marine Corps	9,539		268	9,944	635	800	21,186
Air Force	8,047		6,523	25,017	2,915	4,090	46,592
Subtotal	45,586	12,673	18,503	120,706	6,450	9,916	213,834
Reserve components:							
Army National Guard	3,628	7,049	34	7,339	232	56	18,338
Army Reserve	4,392	2,720	3	8,730	97	52	15,994
Naval Reserve	1,629			1,734		26	3,389
Marine Corps Reserve	2,285		221	1,410		25	3,941
Air National Guard	779			1,909	258	44	2,990
Air Force Reserve	423		30	1,469	100	77	2,099
Subtotal	13,136	9,769	288	22,591	687	280	46,751
Total	58,722	22,442	18,791	143,297	7,137	10,196	260,585

TITLE I, PART E—COMPENSATION, BENEFITS, AND HEALTH CARE MATTERS

SUBPART 1—PAY, ALLOWANCES, AND BENEFITS

SEC. 141, MILITARY PAY RAISE

In its budget request for fiscal year 1985, the Department of Defense proposed a 5.5 percent increase on January 1, 1985, in the basic pay and the basic allowance for subsistence (BAS) of all military personnel. The basic allowance for quarters would be separately adjusted in order to restructure the Variable Housing Allowance (see section 142).

Because of difficult budgetary constraints, the committee has recommended a 4 percent raise on January 1, 1985, in the basic pay and BAS of all personnel, except E-1s with less than 4 months of active duty. These E-1s would receive no pay raise. This recommendation would be identical to the terms of the cost-of-living increase given to military personnel in fiscal year 1984. The adjustment of the basic allowance for quarters is addressed in section 142.

SEC. 142, MODIFICATIONS TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS AND VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE

The basic allowance for quarters and the variable housing allowance are the elements of military compensation designed to help members pay for their housing when the government does not provide quarters. The basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) is no longer directly tied to the cost of housing, either individually or across the uniformed Services. The variable housing allowance (VHA) was designed as a means of defraying high housing costs experienced by those members who were assigned to high cost areas of the country. Under current law, the VHA is provided when the average housing cost of members of the same pay grade in a specific area exceeds 115 percent of the BAQ and is equal to the difference between that average housing cost and 115 percent of BAQ. However, since VHA is tied in law to the amount of BAQ, and since the rates of BAQ have not kept pace with the rise in housing costs, major program growth has occurred in VHA.

In order to save money, Congress has imposed restraints on the rates of BAQ and VHA. These restraints have lessened the ability of VHA to serve its intended purpose, compensating those with high housing costs. The results of the combined restraints on BAQ and VHA have been to sever the relationship of housing compensation and housing costs and to force military members to absorb a higher and higher percentage of housing costs out of other compensation.

The committee believes it is now appropriate to revise the structure of both BAQ and VHA, so that these combined elements will be directly tied to housing costs and so that each military member receiving VHA, regardless of grade or duty location, will be required to fund a proportionate share of their housing expenses out of other compensation.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the rates for basic allowance for quarters, effective on January 1, 1985, be set at 65 percent of national median housing costs with respect to each pay grade and that variable housing allowance be paid only where the local median cost of housing for a pay grade exceeds 80 percent of the national median housing costs for that pay grade. This arrangement, tying BAQ to national median housing costs, would be maintained by periodic revisions to the BAQ rates. It would also insure that no member would receive VHA unless that member were absorbing 15 percent of their housing costs from other compensation and that rate would be true for all personnel receiving VHA.

Additionally, the committee recommends that service members stationed in the future in Alaska and Hawaii, previously not eligible for variable housing allowance, be included in this new program.

Finally, the committee also recommends that certain windfall entitlements be eliminated from the VHA program. Specifically, the VHA would no longer be paid to a member living in government quarters who receives BAQ at the "with dependents" rate solely because the member pays child support, and VHA would no longer be paid to a member in travel status between permanent duty stations.

PERMANENT CHANGE-OF-STATION REIMBURSEMENT

The purpose of the permanent change-of-station (PSC) travel program is to reimburse military members for the cost of Government-directed travel, individually or as part of an organized unit. Reimbursement for mileage is limited to 13 cents for members while reimbursement for the cost to ship household goods is limited by designated weight allowances which vary by grade.

The PCS initiatives included in the administration's original budget are intended to reduce out-of-pocket costs for service members by increasing the mileage allowance from 13 cents to 15 cents and by increasing household goods weight allowances to a maximum of 18,000 pounds. Delaying these increases until fiscal year 1986 would cause members to continue incurring excessive out-of-pocket expenses for Government-directed moves.

Although the administration eliminated these initiatives in its May budget revision, the committee strongly supports implementing these provisions, which are already authorized under current law. The committee urges the Appropriations Committee to include funds for these initiatives in the Defense Appropriations Act and to oppose restrictive language which would limit the household goods allowance to 13,500 pounds, raising the limit instead to 18,000 pounds.

SEC. 143, REIMBURSEMENT FOR ACCOMMODATIONS IN PLACE OF QUARTERS

In 1980, Congress authorized the Navy to reimburse certain enlisted members for the housing expenses they incur when their shipboard quarters are uninhabitable during overhaul. If government quarters ashore, a berthing barge, or Government leased quarters are unavailable, crew members must pay for housing on the private residential market. The reimbursement paid to these individuals is not to exceed the quarters allowance of a member of the same grade without dependents plus the variable housing allowance which could be paid at the location where shipboard quarters are unavailable.

Because the Navy's authority to pay this reimbursement will expire at the end of fiscal year 1984, the committee recommends that it be renewed through fiscal year 1985. The total reimbursement authorized under this section for fiscal year 1985 may not exceed $1.421 million.

SEC. 144, TERMINATION OF LONGEVITY CREDIT FOR TIME IN DELAYED ENLISTMENT PROGRAM

Under section 205(a)(2)(F) of title 37, United States Code, all periods of enlistment in a reserve component of a uniformed Service are creditable in computing the basic pay of a member. Included within this creditable service is the time spent in the Delayed Enlistment Program (DEP).

The Delayed Enlistment Program has as its basis section 511 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the enlistment of qualified personnel as a Reserve for service in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, for a time of not less than 6 nor more than 8 years. Under implementing instructions, the member must enter active duty or initial training within 365 days after enlistment.

Utilizing this statutory authority, the armed forces have established Delayed Enlistment Programs. These programs allow an individual to enlist in the armed forces several months in advance of actually having to report for active duty. This flexibility is advantageous to both the enlistee and the Services. The enlistee has several months in which to continue to pursue other interests, such as completing high school, while the Services are better able to plan and control training programs and other manning programs. Today nearly all recruits entering military service spend time in the DEP, with the average period of time spent in the DEP being approximately 5 months. During that period of time, the enlistee performs no military duties but is merely awaiting orders to report for initial training or active duty.

Because of the existing provisions of section 205(a)(2)(F) of title 37, United States Code, this nonproductive time spent in the DEP is creditable for determining the basic pay of the enlistee throughout his military career. For example, because this time is creditable for computing basic pay, during the initial enlistment of personnel enlisting in Army in fiscal year 1984, the Army military pay budget must be $40 million larger than would be required if this time did not count in computing basic pay. During the initial enlistment of Air Force recruits enlisting in fiscal year 1984, the additional cost to the Air Force military pay budget is $32.8 million. If the present policy of crediting time in the DEP for computing basic pay is continued for only one more year, the additional cost to the Army and Air Force military pay budget for that year would need to be $25 million more than it would be if that policy were changed.

The Services have indicated that the authority to credit DEP time in computing basic pay is a form of recruiting incentive. However, the committee is convinced that this particular policy has little, if any, positive effect on recruiting. Recruiters have indicated that they do not utilize this policy in dealing with prospective recruits and recent recruits are generally unaware that they have received any benefit under this policy. Furthermore, it appears that the deferred nature of this benefit spread out over the entire career of the member is an inefficient use of these funds, at best.

Therefore, the committee has recommended provisions which would provide that in the future recruits entering the armed Services shall not be entitled to count the time they spend in the Delayed Enlistment program in determining years of service for purposes of computing basic pay. Under these provisions, only those who actually enlist and enter the DEP program after October 1, 1984, will be affected. That is, the provisions will not result in a reduction in the pay of any member who has been enlisted under the existing policy.

SEC. 145, COMMUTATION OF RATIONS FOR ENLISTED COAST GUARD RESERVISTS ON INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Section 402(b) of title 37, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary concerned to provide enlisted members of reserve components of the uniformed Services, or of the National Guard, with rations in kind, or a part thereof, when such members are performing periods of inactive duty training lasting at least eight hours in a calendar day. There is no authority under this section to pay a cash allowance in lieu of providing rations in kind.

There are times when, for example, because of nonavailability of Government messes or lack of access to private vendors under Government messing contracts, the Services are unable to provide rations in kind to these personnel. Currently, the Coast Guard is unable to provide rations in kind to approximately 10 percent of its enlisted reservists performing inactive duty training. Those members must provide their own meals without reimbursement.

The committee recommends that the Coast Guard be authorized to provide a cash allowance in lieu of rations in kind in those cases where the Coast Guard cannot furnish meals directly. The other Services have indicated no need for this authority.

SEC. 146, EXTENSION OF ENLISTMENT AND REENLISTMENT BONUS AUTHORITY FOR ACTIVE FORCES

Under current law, the military Services are authorized to pay enlistment bonuses of up to $8,000 for a 4-year enlistment. The largest bonus currently being paid is $5,000, with the exception of individuals participating in the Army's enlistment bonus test program. These bonuses are limited to those who enlist in critical skills, and the majority of the personnel receiving enlistment bonuses enter the Army's combat arms.

Reenlistment bonuses of up to $20,000 are authorized under current law for personnel who reenlist in a critical skill. Only nuclear qualified petty officers are eligible for the maximum bonus; other skills are limited to $16,000.

The current authority of the Department of Defense to pay these bonuses expires on September 30, 1984. The committee recommends extending the current authority to pay enlistment and reenlistment bonuses for 2 years, until September 30, 1986.

SEC. 147, AVIATION OFFICER CONTINUATION PAY

In passing the fiscal year 1981 Defense Authorization Act, the Congress enacted a new continuation bonus for aviation officers in an effort to improve the serious manning shortages in these skills. Subsequent to its original enactment, the bonus was limited to Navy and Marine Corps aviators only. Both the Navy and Marine Corps are convinced that this bonus has been a major factor in their improved aviator retention in recent years. Better retention results in more experienced aviators flying Navy and Marine Corps aircraft which, in turn, results in fewer accidents. The funding required to pay the bonus in fiscal year 1985 is $21 million, substantially less than the replacement cost of one F-14 aircraft.

The legislative history of the Aviation Officer Continuation Pay clearly indicates that Congress intended this special pay to be a short-term bonus targeted to critical aviation skills. In its report on the Uniformed Services Pay and Benefits Act of 1981 (Senate Report 97-146), this committee stated that the Aviation Officer Continuation Pay "should only be paid in aviation specialties where retention problems and shortages exist that cannot be addressed by other management action or initiatives. It should not be paid solely because it is being paid to the same or other types of aviators in the same or in another service". The committee went on to state that "within the Navy and Marine Corps, if the retention levels of one category of aviator cease to be a problem, then the payment of the bonus to that category would cease even if payment to another category is warranted and continued".

Last year, Congress extended the authorization for the Aviation Officer Continuation Pay for 1 year. The fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98-94) limited payment of the bonus to Navy and Marine Corps pilots. Navigators (NFOs) were excluded because the Navy and Marine Corps did not have shortages of NFOs in the grades and years of service for which the bonus was authorized. However, the fiscal year 1984 Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 98-212) included authority to pay the bonus to all Navy and Marine Corps aviators (pilots and NFOs), although the Act stipulated that the bonus should be paid to "aviation specialties where shortages actually exists".

The bonus authority limited payment to Navy and Marine Corps aviators with 6 through 10 years of service, since experience has shown this period to be the critical decision point for retention. The size of the bonus is $4,000 per year for a 3-year commitment, or $6,000 per year for a 4-year or 6-year commitment.

In January 1984, the Navy and Marine Corps began paying the Aviation Officer Continuation Pay to all eligible aviators (pilots and NFOs) with between 6 and 10 years of service. In March 1984, Navy and Marine Corps officials testified before the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee that only the Navy continues to have a pilot shortage in the grades and years of service for which the bonus is authorized. This testimony indicated that the Navy does not have an overall NFO shortage, and the Marine Corps does not have a pilot or an NFO shortage, in the grades and years of service for which the bonus is authorized. Subsequent material presented by the Navy to the committee suggests that the Navy continues to have shortages of NFOs in certain communities, particularly in sea-based squadrons.

The committee is concerned that despite the clear and repeated congressional intent that this bonus be applied only to aviation skills where shortages actually exist, in fiscal year 1984 the Navy and Marine Corps have applied this bonus in an across-the-board fashion to all aviators in the grades and years of service for which the bonus was authorized.

After thoroughly reviewing this matter, the committee recommends a provision (section 147) extending the authority to pay the Aviation Officer Continuation Pay for one additional year, through September 30, 1985. Because the Marine Corps no longer has a shortage of aviators in the grades and years of service for which the bonus is authorized, the committee has restricted the payment of the bonus to Navy aviators only. The committee reiterates that this bonus should not be applied across-the-board to all Navy aviators, but should be targeted to those aviation communities where shortages actually exist.

Indeed, the Department of the Navy has indicated to the committee that it is considering a plan to discontinue the payment of the bonus to all aviation communities. Instead, it plans to pay the bonus to aviators only in sea-based squadrons. The Navy's plan would exclude those aviators in land-based communities. Although the committee has not yet had the opportunity to review this plan, it believes the Department's initiative to target the payment of the bonus to specific aviation communities holds promise and is more consistent with the original intent of Congress. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit its plan for paying this bonus during fiscal year 1985 to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than September 1, 1984.

Despite the original congressional intent that the Aviation Officer Continuation Pay be used as a short-term bonus to restore aviator retention to required levels, there is some indication that Navy officials are beginning to regard this bonus as a longer-term career aviation pay. The committee notes that the current Aviation Career Incentive Pay was designed to meet this goal for all of the Services. Accordingly, section 147 also directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by April 15, 1985 on the adequacy of the current career pay for aviation specialties, particularly Aviation Career Incentive Pay, to meet the long-term career aviation needs of all the military Services.

SEC. 148, HAZARDOUS DUTY PAYS

The committee proposes that the enlisted and officer rates for several hazardous duty incentive pays be equalized and that two unnecessary hazardous duty incentive pays be discontinued.

The Fifth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation (QRMC) examined special and incentive pays in great detail. One of its conclusions was that the differential between enlisted and officer rates for seven hazardous duty incentive pays should be eliminated. Currently, enlisted personnel receive $83 per month and officers receive $110 per month as an incentive to perform various kinds of hazardous duty. The following are the seven pays identified by the Fifth QRMC for equalization: flight deck duty, demolition duty, experimental stress, non-crewmember flight pay, parachute duty, toxic fuels and propellants, and toxic pesticides and dangerous organisms.

The committee agrees that enlisted and officer personnel should be paid the same incentive for exposing themselves to similar hazards. Therefore, it recommends that the rates for these seven hazardous duty pays be changed to entitle both enlisted and officer personnel to $110 per month.

Another conclusion of the Fifth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation was that the payment of two hazardous duty incentive pays, glider pay and leprosy pay, was no longer necessary. The committee accepts this QRMC recommendation and proposes that authority to pay these special pays be discontinued.

SEC. 149, RECOMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN RECALLED RETIREES

During the height of the Vietnam war, a number of retired senior non-commissioned officers were invited to return to active duty. These retirees, predominately Marines, were needed because of shortages of senior non-commissioned officers in certain specialties. Many of these retirees answered that call to return to active duty.

In the letters of invitation sent to these retirees, they were promised that upon their release from active duty, their retired or retainer pay would be recomputed based upon the pay rates then in effect with credit for the additional active service. Unfortunately, existing law did not permit such recomputation.

Because the committee believes that these retirees who answered the call of their Nation to return to duty were misled about the circumstances under which they were being recalled, the committee has included a provision to permit the recomputation of these retired members' retired and retainer pay utilizing the pay rates in effect at the time of their release from the active duty to which they were recalled.

Under the committee's provision, these members' retired or retainer pay in the future would be computed utilizing as a base the pay scales in effect upon their release. Additionally, in order to determine the amount of future retired pay, the cost-of-living adjustments which would have been made had that base been utilized since the time of their release would be taken into account. However, there would be no back pay authorized under the committee provision.

SEC. 150, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN RESERVE COMPONENT INSTRUCTORS

The committee has become aware of a situation in which it appears that certain reservists are being compelled to absorb the costs of duty related travel expenses in an inequitable manner.

Members of the uniformed Services, including reservists, are entitled to travel and transportation allowances for travel performance under orders under certain circumstances. One of these circumstances is travel performance when away from his designated place of duty or when away from home to perform duty. There is no entitlement to such allowances for travel performed from home to a designated place of duty, except upon initial entry into the Service or upon separation.

There are many reserve component members who travel great distances from their home to their designated place of duty to perform inactive duty training. In most cases, this travel is performed because the member has voluntarily elected to serve in a reserve unit or position away from his home, and travel allowances are properly not paid for this travel. However, it has been brought to the committee's attention that in some cases this general rule, which the committee supports, is being used with a result that appears inequitable. Specifically, in the case of personnel assigned to United States Army Reserve Schools, the Army Comptroller has ruled that when instructors assigned to these schools are assigned to teach classes at other Reserve units for periods in excess of three months, then the locations of those teaching sites becomes the instructors' designated places of duty, rather than the location of the school unit to which that instructor is assigned. The result is that these instructors may be required to travel, at their own expense, to the location of instruction. In some areas of the country this can involve travel of several hundred miles, and the distance is often much greater than that between the member's home and the location of the member's parent unit.

Therefore, the committee has included a provision providing entitlement to travel and transportation expenses for travel performed by a member not on active duty who is attending a reserve training meeting for the purpose of performing instructor duties at that meeting and the member's home is more than 100 miles from the training location.

SEC. 151, DOMICILE TO DUTY TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN OFFICIALS

Section 1344 of title 31, United States Code, restricts the expenditure of funds of motor vehicle transportation to official purposes and provides that transportation from domicile to place of employment is not an official purpose except in the case of the President, heads of executive departments, and principal diplomatic and consulate officials.

The General Counsel of the Department of Defense has interpreted the phrase "heads of executive departments" to mean "principal officers of executive departments." Based upon that interpretation, domicile to duty transportation has been provided to the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Under Secretaries of Defense.

In a decision dated June 3, 1983, the Comptroller General rejected the interpretation of 31 U.S.C. 1344 given to it by the Department of Defense and held that within the Department of Defense only the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments could be provided domicile to duty transportation under that statute. However, because it was recognized that there was confusion throughout the Government about the limits of the statute, the decision was not to be put into effect until after the *sine die* adjournment of the 98th Congress. The decision also recommended that consideration be given to expanding the scope of authority in 31 U.S.C. 1344 in appropriate cases.

The committee believes it is appropriate to permit the use of government vehicles to provide domicile to duty transportation to certain officials in the Department of Defense in addition to those authorized that transportation under 31 U.S.C. 1344. Therefore, the committee has included a provision to authorize the providing of domicile to duty transportation for the following defense officials:

Deputy Secretary of Defense;
Under Secretaries of Defense;
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Chief of Staff of the Army;
Chief of Naval Operations;
Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The committee believes it is an appropriate and wise use of funds to provide this transportation to these officials because of the critical and time sensitive nature of their duties.

SEC. 152, FORFEITURE OF ACCRUED LEAVE BY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF A UNIFORMED SERVICE DISCHARGED PRIOR TO SERVING SATISFACTORILY ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR 6 MONTHS

Under current law, all officers and enlisted members of a uniformed Service accumulate 2.5 days of annual leave for each month of active service. An officer or member who has not used all of his or her accrued leave at the time of discharge or separation generally is entitled to a lump sum payment based on his or her daily pay rate for such unused leave. Currently, these provisions apply regardless of the length of the individual's active Service.

The President's private sector survey on cost control, also known as the Grace Commission, recently noted that a significant number of servicemembers are discharged or separated before completing 6 months of active duty and are paid for any unused leave prior to their separation. The Commission pointed out that this policy offers no benefits to the armed forces and that the cost savings resulting from the forfeiture of their leave entitlement for individuals serving less than 6 months satisfactorily would not adversely affect recruiting and retention.

Accordingly, the Department of Defense has proposed, and the committee recommends, a provision providing forfeiture of all unused annual leave accrued by an officer or enlisted member of a uniformed service who is discharged or separated for failing to serve satisfactorily before completing 6 months of active duty. This provision would apply to servicemembers who receive honorable or general discharges but are separated before completing 6 months of active duty service because of unsatisfactory performance. As a result of this provision, such members would not receive additional compensation for unused accrued leave when they are discharged or separated.

The committee proposal is similar to the forfeiture provision in subsection 501(e) of title 37, United States Code, that provides that a member discharged under other than honorable conditions forfeits all accrued leave to his credit at the time of his discharge. This provision would not apply to servicemembers who are not at fault for the early termination of their active duty, such as those who receive a hardship discharge under section 1173 of title 10, United States Code, or who are retired, discharged or separated for a physical disability under sections 1201 through 1206 of that title.

This provision applies to all members of a uniformed Service entering active duty on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 153, LIMITATION ON TRANSPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES THROUGH GUAM

Under the Joint Travel Regulations, the Defense Department has permitted vehicles owned by U.S. servicemen stationed abroad to be shipped back to the United States at Government expense at the end of a servicemember's tour. Normally, only those United States servicemen who owned their foreign-purchased car for more than 1 year can ship their car back to the United States at Government expense.

In recent years, there have been a growing number of foreign-purchased cars brought into the United States through a loop-hole in the joint travel regulations. This loop-hole allows designation of Guam as an alternate port for shipping foreign-purchased cars of U.S. servicemen stationed in Okinawa and Japan into the United States. Because Guam is a United States territory, the designation of Guam as an alternate port for the shipment of foreign-purchased cars into the United States allows servicemembers to circumvent the requirement of owning a foreign-purchased car for more than 1 year before shipping it back to the United States at Government expense.

This alternative port designation shifts transportation costs for foreign cars purchased in Guam from the manufacturer to the United States taxpayer. The result is to provide a significant financial incentive for U.S. servicemen stationed in Japan and Okinawa to purchase a foreign-made car in Guam and bring it back into the United States. The alternate port designation actually promotes the sale of foreign-made vehicles. The committee does not believe this is an appropriate method of reimbursing members for the unusual costs they may incur in the sale and purchase of automobiles made necessary by foreign governments' restrictive safety or environmental requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (section 153) that would limit the number of foreign-purchased cars that could be brought into the United States through Guam under the alternate port designation to 100 per month through March 1985. The provision terminates the Defense Department's authority under the joint regulations to designate Guam as an alternate port after March 1985.

SEC. 154, ENHANCED DEBT COLLECTION AUTHORITY FOR THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Debt Collection Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-365) was designed to enhance the Government's capability to collect its debts. Among its provisions, that Act amended section 5514 of title 5, United States Code, which, prior to amendment, provided that indebtedness of an employee of the Government or a member of the armed forces to the Government because of overpayment could be deducted in monthly installments by deductions from the current pay account of the member. The maximum amount that could be collected in a month could not exceed two-thirds of the pay from which the deduction was made. The amendments made by the Debt Collection Act of 1982 to this section vastly broadened the scope of debts which could be collected under the authority of section 5514 of title 5 to "debts to which the United States is entitled to be repaid." Because of the vast expansion of the type of debts covered, numerous procedural rules were provided, including the right of a debtor to have a hearing and reduction of the maximum collection rate to 15 percent per month. However, the authority of the Services to continue to collect debts under section 1007(c) of title 37, United States Code, without regard to the requirements of section 5514 of title 5, was continued.

Under section 1007 of title 37, United States Code, the Army and Air Force (but not the Navy and Marine Corps) can administratively collect overpayments made to enlisted members (but not officers) by deduction from the member's current pay account. The maximum deduction may not exceed two-thirds of the pay due under the account from which the deduction is made.

The committee does not believe the purposes of the Debt Collection Act of 1982 would be served by preventing the Navy and Marine Corps from utilizing the provisions of section 1007 of title 37, or that officers should not be subject to the provisions of that collection statute. Because of the nature of the military pay system, thousands of overpayments occur each month, affecting the pay of officers and enlisted personnel. The General Accounting Office, in the proposed implementing rules for administration of the Debt Collection Act, noted that Congress must have intended for the Services to be able to exercise that authority.

Therefore, the committee has included a provision amending section 1007(c) of title 37 to make its provisions applicable to all members of the armed forces.

SEC. 155, REPEAL OF 1989 GI BILL TERMINATION DATE

In order to qualify for educational assistance benefits under the Vietnam-era GI bill, an individual must have entered military service before December 31, 1976. Furthermore, all those who qualified for benefits must actually use them by December 31, 1989. Congress chose the 1989 termination date because it would allow all eligible servicemen at least 10 years after their initial enlistments in which to use their GI bill benefits.

The committee is deeply concerned that many active-duty personnel who are eligible for the Vietnam-era GI bill may decide to leave the military prematurely in order to use their educational benefits before their termination in 1989. The Department of Defense has estimated that more than 841,000 servicemen still on active-duty joined the military before 1977 and, therefore, are eligible for GI bill benefits. Many of these personnel will have the opportunity to use their educational benefits because they will retire or separate before 1989 whether or not the termination date is repealed. However, if the termination date is repealed, almost half of them, or 404,000, are expected to still be in the armed Services in 1990. By losing the benefits they earned during the Vietnam-era, they would effectively be penalized for their decision to remain in the military.

The committee is determined to insure that the 1989 termination date does not unfairly force a difficult career decision on military personnel. In addition, the committee is concerned that the Services' manpower readiness would suffer if skilled, experienced noncommissioned officers (NCOs) left active duty to take advantage of their GI bill benefits. These NCOs carry out important leadership and technical duties that directly contribute to the effectiveness of our fighting forces.

The Senate has made it clear that it shares this committee's concerns about the negative effects of the 1989 termination date. Three separate bills approved by the Senate in this Congress and in the two preceding Congresses have repealed the termination date. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives has consistently refused to agree to the Senate actions.

The committee recommends the repeal of subsection 1662(e) of title 38, the provision which prohibits the payment of GI bill benefits after December 31, 1989. Eliminating the 1989 termination date effectively allows eligible servicemembers 10 years from the date of their separation from the military in which to use their GI bill benefits.

The major purpose for repealing the termination date is to enhance retention rather than to assist veterans in readjusting to civilian life. Therefore, this section would require the Defense Department to fund the cost of all Vietnam-era GI bill benefits paid after December 31, 1989. The Department has testified that it is willing to bear this responsibility.

SEC. 156, MEMBERSHIP ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BOARD OF ACTUARIES

The Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984 (Public Law 98-94) created a Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund and established a Board of Actuaries. The Board is to review valuations of the fund and report periodically to the President and the Congress on the status of the fund.

Presently, the law provides that the Board shall consist of three members appointed by the President from among qualified professional actuaries who are members of the Society of Actuaries.

The committee has become aware that limiting the Board membership to only those who are members of the Society of Actuaries may unduly restrict participation on the Board, and in fact, deprives many highly qualified, professional actuaries of an opportunity for service on this Board. At the same time, the committee is aware that the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries, established by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), has been delegated the authority to determine the qualifications necessary for individuals to certify actuarial calculations for retirement plans covered by ERISA. The Joint Board requires that persons certifying actuarial calculations for ERISA plans attain the designation of "Enrolled Actuary", and that designation is based upon experience and examination requirements.

The committee believes that the present qualifications for membership on the Board of Actuaries are unduly restrictive. Therefore, it has recommended that these membership qualifications be changed to permit the President to appoint to the Board, individuals enrolled by the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries.

SEC. 157, AUTHORIZATION FOR LEGAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES

The armed forces presently provide legal assistance to members, their dependents, and certain other categories of personnel to the extent the resources available to the particular Service will permit. This important service is presently provided pursuant to regulations of each individual service. Among the more important aspects of each Service's program is preventive law activities designed to decrease the volume of legal problems confronting military personnel and their dependents.

The committee believes that these valuable and important programs should be recognized in law. Therefore, the committee has recommended provisions which would provide that, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned and subject to the availability of resources, members on active duty shall be furnished legal assistance and that dependents of active duty personnel, retired personnel, and their dependents may be provided such services. While these provisions would create an entitlement of legal assistance for active duty personnel, the entitlement would be subject to the availability of manpower and other resources of the Services. This recognizes that while legal assistance on personal legal affairs is an important service which should be provided to military personnel, there are times, especially during time of war or hostilities, in which military personnel normally providing that service will be needed for higher priority activities, or in which other resource restraints may not permit the immediate provision of this service to all personnel.

INVOLUNTARY "SURE PAY" FOR ARMY PERSONNEL

On April 26, 1984, the Army announced plans to convert, beginning on July 1, 1984, to an involuntary "sure pay" method for paying all members of the Army. Under the "sure pay" system, a member's pay, rather than being delivered to the member directly, must be delivered to a financial institution, albeit an institution of the member's selection.

The "sure pay" system of paying soldiers and officers of the Army has been available for use, at the individual's option, for a number of years. Approximately 55 percent of Army personnel have chosen to utilize this system. There is no doubt that "sure pay" offers a number of attractive features to both the individual and to the Army. For example, with the highly mobile nature of military duty, soldiers are often moved on short notice, especially in the event of mobilization, and often are unable to make arrangements to have their pay delivered to a new permanent address or may not even have a good address to which the check can be delivered in a timely manner. As a result, the pay of a member may be delayed and this can create serious morale problems, not to mention the financial difficulties it can cause. The Army also believes that "sure pay" eliminates for soldiers such problems as standing in line to purchase money orders and deciding how to safeguard cash. Additionally, there are benefits to the Army, such as reduced administrative workload.

While the committee recognizes the advantages of a "sure pay" system, it has serious concerns about making such a system mandatory. At present, there are a number of significant questions that have not been resolved about how such a system may affect individual soldiers. For example:

(1) There is no authority for the Army to pay or reimburse soldiers for any fees which may be imposed by financial institutions upon soldiers for opening, maintaining or using the account to which their pay checks must be delivered. If the local available institutions do not offer such services without charge, the proposed "sure pay" system has the effect of involuntarily reducing the soldier's pay.

(2) While it is true that soldiers may have to endure standing in long lines to cash their paychecks, soldiers can be reasonably sure that they can have their government checks cashed at most locations. The same is not true for personal checks, especially when drawn on financial institutions located outside the immediate area in which the soldier is located. It may be difficult for soldiers to cash personal checks in amounts equal to their pay at any location other than at the financial institution upon which the check is drawn.

(3) Because most financial institutions do not mail to a soldier a receipt for a "sure pay" deposit made, or if they do, only several days after the pay check is actually deposited, soldiers will have to accept on faith that their pay is deposited in their account and available for draw on their payday. While experience has shown that the "sure pay" system is generally reliable in depositing a soldier's pay in the correct account on time, errors do occur. The result can be that soldiers make and utter checks for which there are insufficient funds available when those checks are presented for payment. In those cases, soldiers may well become liable for charges for dishonored checks by either, or both, the financial institution involved or the payee of the check. Once again, there is no authority for the Army to pay or reimburse the soldier for these charges. While delays in delivery of paychecks also may occur when these checks are delivered directly to a soldier, at least the soldier will be aware of those delays and can act accordingly and not incur the additional charges arising from dishonored checks.

Under the present system of voluntary participation in "sure pay", the member can make an individual judgment about whether the benefits of "sure pay" outweigh its drawbacks, and that judgment is based upon a myriad of personal and individual factors. In announcing its plans to make the system mandatory for all soldiers, the Army seeks to interpose its one institutional judgment about the very personal matter of personal finances for that of the individual soldier.

The committee does not believe that the Army has made a sufficiently strong case for why it should mandatorily impose this pay system upon each individual in the Army. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study of the methods for paying members of the Army, including alternatives to the involuntary "sure pay" system, and to address in that report the pros and cons of various alternatives and to submit that report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 1, 1984. Pending receipt of that report, the committee urges the Secretary of the Army not to implement an involuntary "sure pay" system.

SEC. 158, ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY OFFSET

Section 1451 of title 10, United States Code, provides the method for the calculation of the amount of annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP). Subsection (a)(3) of that section provides that when a widow or widower reaches age 62, or no longer has a dependent child, whichever occurs later, the monthly SBP annuity shall be reduced by the lesser of (1) the amount of the survivor benefit to which the widow would be entitled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) based solely upon the post-1956 military service of the deceased servicemember spouse, or (2) 40 percent of the monthly annuity.

These provisions have been interpreted to require that the monthly SBP annuity be reduced even when the widow or widower is receiving a Social Security retirement benefit based solely on that person's own work.

The committee does not believe that an SBP annuitant who has earned and is receiving a Social Security retirement benefit based on his own work record should be penalized by having their SBP annuity reduced.

Therefore, the committee has included provisions to amend section 1451(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to insure that no reduction will occur in the SBP annuity amount when the Social Security benefit to which the annuitant is entitled is based upon the annuitant's own earnings.

SEC. 159, AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE MEMBER'S STATUS FOR PURPOSES OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN SURVIVOR BENEFITS

The committee has become aware of a deficiency in both the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan (RSFPP) and the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) which arises when participants in those programs disappear under circumstances in which it is reasonable to conclude that such participants have died. The deficiency is that there presently exists no authority for a determination of death. A determination of death of the participant is necessary to permit the payment of annuities under both the RSFPP and SBP. Under decisions of the Comptroller General, when a member entitled to retired or retainer pay is determined to be missing, the retired pay of that member may not be paid. Under the existing law, the result is that when a retired member is declared missing, the beneficiary of that member, usually the member's spouse, is denied access to the member's retired pay and may not be paid an annuity under either RSFPP or SBP, as the case may be.

The committee therefore has included provisions which would permit the Secretary concerned to make a determination that a participant in either RSFPP or SBP is missing under circumstances from which it can be reasonably concluded that such person is dead, provided the person has been absent for at least 30 days. Such a determination would permit the payment of an annuity under either RSFPP or SBP to begin.

Under the committee recommendation, if a person were determined to be missing and were later found to be alive, the amount of annuity paid would constitute a debt to the United States which could be collected or offset from retired or retainer pay due that person, from compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration to that person, or from any other moneys owed to that person by the United States. Furthermore, if that person were to die before such recovery were made, collection of the debt could be made against that person's beneficiary under RSFPP or SBP, as the case may be, if the beneficiary were the same person having previously been paid annuity payments as a result of the missing status determination.

SEC. 160, MODIFICATION OF ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES UNDER THE UNIFORMED SERVICES FORMER SPOUSES PROTECTION ACT

The committee has become aware that because of certain statutory definitions used in the Uniformed Services Former Spouses Protection Act (Title X, Public Law 97-252), the simplified enforcement mechanisms under that Act are not available for use in enforcing the collection of child support or alimony in certain cases. This arises because enforcement is available only for court orders which specifically direct that payments be made from the retired or retainer pay of a member. While such a requirement is appropriate in situations involving the division of retired pay as property, it is not common practice for courts to specify the source of child support or alimony. As a result, many final court decrees which direct that a military retiree pay child support or alimony cannot be enforced under the Uniformed Services Former Spouses Protection Act and can only be enforced under more cumbersome, and often more expensive, garnishment procedures.

One of the purposes of the Uniformed Services Former Spouses Protection Act was to provide an efficient method of enforcing court orders for child support, for alimony, and for division of retired pay. In cases of division of retired pay, it is necessary and proper that the court order be required to specify that the property be from the pay. However, there appears to be no reason to require that same specificity in the cases involving alimony or child support payments.

Therefore, the committee has included provisions which would eliminate the requirement that, with respect to child support or alimony payments, court orders specify that such payments be from retired pay. Additionally, the provisions included by the committee would make other conforming and technical amendments required by this primary change. The amendments which would be made by these provisions would be applicable only to court orders which are effectively served on the Secretary concerned on or after the date of enactment. None of the provisions recommended by the committee would permit the mechanisms of the Uniformed Services Former Spouses Protection Act to be utilized to collect payments from any monies owed to a member or former member other than retired or retainer pay.

The committee is aware of the concerns expressed by some that the recommended provisions may subject some military retirees to court orders for alimony which were obtained in violation of the retirees' rights under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as those rights existed at the time the court order was entered, and that since no additional court action will be required on the part of a former spouse in order to obtain enforcement of orders under the provisions, the retiree will not be afforded an opportunity to raise such defense. The committee believes that the existing requirements contained in section 1408(b) of title 10, which requires that for a court order to be effectively served under that section, the order itself or other accompanying documents must reflect observation of the requirements of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, provide sufficient protections to military retirees who may be affected by court orders which will become enforceable under the committee's provisions.

The committee has also included one other provision designed to correct an unintended result under the Former Spouses Protection Act. Under the provisions of that Act, for any court order to be enforced it must be effectively served on an appropriate agent of the Secretary concerned. Section 1408(b)(1)(c) of title 10 also requires that either the court order or documents accompanying that order identify the member concerned and "include the social security of such member." The intent of this language was to insure that the proper military pay account was affected when payments began pursuant to the order. Since each of the Services now utilize the social security number as the primary source of identification of retired pay accounts, the requirement that the military member's social security number be included in the documents served on the Service seemed reasonable.

The committee now has become aware that this requirement in law is too stringent. In at least one case, a former spouse's request for enforcement under the Former Spouses Act provisions has been refused because of that former spouse's inability to furnish the member's social security number, although the member's serial number is known and has been served with the court order. It was not intended that an inability to provide a social security number should be a bar to enforcement.

Therefore, the committee has included an amendment to section 1408(b)(1)(c) to make the inclusion of the member's social security member a desirable, but not required, condition of effective service.

SEC. 160A, DESIGNATION OF FORMER SPOUSES AS BENEFICIARIES

The Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1983 (Public Law 97-252) included provisions permitting, for the first time, the designation of a former spouse as a beneficiary under the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP). Certain technical changes to these provisions were made in the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984 (Public Law 98-94) to effectuate the purpose of the earlier provisions. The concept underlying these provisions was to provide members eligible to participate in SBP the option, under certain conditions, of voluntarily electing to provide an annuity to a former spouse, even if that former spouse had no insurable interest in the member. An important feature of this concept was that the option was to be a voluntary act of the member. To insure the voluntary nature of this option, section 1450(f)(3) of title 10, United States Code, was added to make it clear that no court had the authority to order a member to involuntarily designate a former spouse as an SBP beneficiary.

At the same time, it was recognized that the issue of whether a member would designate a former spouse as an SBP beneficiary could very well become an item of negotiation in a divorce settlement, and that if the member voluntarily agreed in writing to make such an election, the former spouse should be entitled to rely upon that agreement. Therefore, sections 1450(f) (2) and (3) limit the circumstances under which a member may change an election under SBP after designating a former spouse as beneficiary pursuant to a written agreement.

It has been brought to the committee's attention that there is a deficiency in the present provisions which permits members to subvert the basic intent of these provisions. Specifically, in at least one case, a member has agreed in writing to designate a former spouse as an SBP beneficiary and has permitted a court to incorporate or ratify the agreement in a court order. The member has then refused to sign the documents utilized by the Defense Department to actually designate that former spouse as beneficiary. In the opinion of the Defense Department, its officials are without authority to enforce the court-ordered agreement without the member taking the additional step of actually electing the former spouse as beneficiary.

The committee believes this type of action is totally contrary to the underlying concepts of the provisions cited above.

Therefore, the committee has recommended further changes to the Survivor Benefit Plan which would provide that in situations like that described, it shall be deemed that the member has elected the former spouse as beneficiary under SBP, if the Secretary concerned receives a request for such action from the former spouse and is provided a court order reflecting the court's ratification, incorporation, or approval of a written agreement by the member to make such an election.

SUBPART 2—HEALTH CARE MATTERS

SEC. 161, IMPROVED BENEFITS UNDER CHAMPUS

Enhanced Vision Care

In order to meet the defense requirements of the United States, it is necessary for the Services to recruit and retain high quality personnel. To do this, the Services must compete with all the private U.S. employers for this pool of manpower. The Services' ability to compete is determinate upon several factors, key among them being the compensation and health benefits package. Health benefits, as a part of military compensation, have a direct impact on how well recruitment and retention objectives are met.

Regarding the health benefits available to dependents under the military services' Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) plan, certain benefit provisions compare less favorably with those being offered by progressive employers in the private sector. For example, eye and vision care benefits are restricted under CHAMPUS, while in the private sector approximately 20 percent of all U.S. employees and their dependents receive preventive and routine eye and vision care services as part of their health care benefits package. Vision problems, including functional vision problems and ocular disease, are among the most prevalent of all health problems in the U.S. population. In fact, eye and vision problems comprise the second most chronic health condition in our Nation. In many instances the severity or consequences of eye and vision problems can be reduced by early and prompt intervention, when identified by an examination by an optometrist or an ophthalmologist. Such an examination can reveal not only functional disorders (refractive error, visual performance problems, low vision) and eye disease but also symptoms of such systematic problems as hypertension and diabetes.

Military medical facilities are authorized to provide routine eye examinations to dependents on a space available basis. However, for dependents of members who are assigned to or reside in areas where medical facility access is limited or where there is insufficient military optometric and ophthalmological manpower, this results in an inequity because these examinations currently are excluded statutorily from CHAMPUS coverage. Thus, the full cost of such examinations from civilian sources must be borne by the beneficiaries. The elimination of the current specific exclusion (routine eye examinations under CHAMPUS) will begin to ameliorate the inequity which currently exists.

Therefore, the committee has included a provision to permit not more than one eye examination per year per patient under CHAMPUS coverage.

Chiropractic Care

The committee also recommends that benefits under CHAMPUS be enhanced by including chiropractic care among the types of care which is covered under that program. Therefore, the committee has included provisions which define this type of care for which CHAMPUS coverage would be provided.

The committee notes that chiropractic is an intergral part of today's health care delivery system. Chiropractic is included in many other Federal programs such as Medicare, Federal employees health benefit plans, and worker's compensation. Chiropractic qualifies for a medical deduction under I.R.S. regulations. The Department of Health and Human Services classifies doctors of chiropractic as a category I health care provider as are medical doctors, doctors of osteopathy and doctors of dentistry.

A recent annual survey conducted by the American Chiropractic Association indicates that as many as 9 million Americans used the services of the approximately 30,000 doctors of chiropractic in 1982. Studies of workers' compensation cases have indicated that chiropractic is extremely cost-effective in the treatment of certain injuries.

The committee believes that those eligible for the CHAMPUS program should have the freedom to choose chiropractic care as an alternative service. Other health care providers included in the above mentioned programs are eligible to receive reimbursements under CHAMPUS, as are christian science practitioners.

The committee urges that in establishing procedures to insure the quality and appropriateness of care delivered under this authority, CHAMPUS include provisions including doctors of chiropractic, with credentials as prescribed by CHAMPUS, in the monitoring of such care.

SEC. 162, DENTAL CARE FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS AND RETIREES

Last year, in its report on the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act, the committee noted that insuring continuity of dental care for military retirees and providing dental care for dependents of active duty military members are important concerns of this committee. The committee asked the Department of Defense to consider ways to increase the amount of dental care provided to military retirees and dependents of active duty personnel under current law, and to estimate the costs of various dental insurance plans for active duty dependents and military retirees.

In a report submitted to the committee on February 29, 1984, the Defense Department indicated that a study has been directed to evaluate the possibilities of increasing the opportunity for routine care for military retirees through flexible scheduling and the use of extended hours. This study will be done at selected locations in each of the military services within existing resources. This study should provide useful information on the possible increase in access by retirees to dental facilities, the acceptance of flexible schedules by the beneficiary population, and any benefits that may be developed by provider or beneficiary. The committee requests the Department of Defense to provide the results of this study to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than 1985.

As the committee noted in its report last year, while care in military dental facilities is available to military retirees and dependents of active duty personnel "subject to availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff" (10 U.S.C. 1076, 1084), there are further restrictions in law on dental care for military dependents. Under 10 U.S.C. 1077, dental care in military dental facilities authorized for military dependents is limited to emergency dental care; care as a necessary adjunct of medical, surgical or preventive treatment; and routine care only outside the United States or at stations in the United States where adequate civilian facilities are not available.

Under current fiscal constraints, it is unlikely that the Congress will authorize a dental insurance plan for active duty dependents along the lines of the current CHAMPUS program. In light of this reality, the committee recomends a provision (section 162) removing the current restrictions on dental care within the United States for active duty dependents in 10 U.S.C. 1077. Removing the restrictions will give dependents of active duty personnel access to care in military dental facilities on the same space-available basis throughout the continental United States as they now have in overseas areas or at stations in the United States where adequate civilian facilities are not available.

When space in military dental facilities is available, for example, due to missed appointments, procedures performed quicker than anticipated, or because of the temporary absence of large segments of the active duty population, the committee believes it is reasonable and appropriate to authorize the utilization of these facilities for active duty dependent care on the same space-available basis by which active dependents receive treatment in military medical facilities.

Authorizing space-available dental care within the United States for active duty dependents will not require any additional manpower, facilities or other resources beyond current levels, with the possible exception of limited amounts of expendable supplies.

SEC. 163, LINKAGE OF CHAMPUS TO MEDICARE

The administration has requested and the committee has included provisions to require institutions that provide services under Medicare to provide services under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS).

Section 931 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984 (Public Law 98-94) included provisions authorizing CHAMPUS to utilize Medicare reimbursement procedures in paying providers of care under CHAMPUS. However, because CHAMPUS beneficiaries form a relatively small proportion of the health care beneficiaries in the nation (less than 1 percent of the number of Medicare enrollees and less than 3 percent of hospital revenues), medical care providers could well refuse to provide care to CHAMPUS beneficiaries under the cost-containing Medicare reimbursement rules. This would result in CHAMPUS beneficiaries being required to pay the entire cost of their care or being denied care by providers.

The provisions recommended by the committee would require that any institution which chooses to participate in Medicare to participate in CHAMPUS. These provisions would continue the important voluntary feature of Medicare, inasmuch as any institution would still retain the right to elect to participate or not to participate in the Medicare system. However, if any institution does elect to participate in Medicare, which because of the large market share represented by Medicare enrollees it is likely to do, that institution would be required also to participate in CHAMPUS and provide care to the much smaller group covered by CHAMPUS.

These provisions will go a long way in helping control and contain the costs of CHAMPUS. A March 1984 Congressional Budget Office study, "Options for Change in Military Medical Care", indicates that implementation of such a provision "could save CHAMPUS at least $100 million a year and perhaps even more in the future."

However, the committee is also aware of concerns about the effect the changes recommended by the committee might have on various segments of the medical care provider community. Because some segments of that community bear a greater share of the costs of indigent health care, concern has surfaced about whether the addition of CHAMPUS beneficiaries, under Medicare reimbursement procedures, might not exacerbate an already difficult financial situation for those segments of the provider community.

In order to give the committee more information on this issue and to make any adjustments in its provisions that may be required by this problem, the committee's recommended provisions do not take effect until October 1, 1985. In the interim, the Secretary of Defense is directed to provide the committee a report, not later than March 1, 1985, on the expected changes in the CHAMPUS patient workload and CHAMPUS aggregate payment levels to various segments of the provider community. The report should address the possible effects any changes in those areas might have upon private, public, non-profit, and teaching facilities and providers.

INCREASED EMPHASIS ON WELLNESS

The committee has been supportive of efforts to improve the health and well-being of military personnel and their dependents. The committee notes the increasing emphasis within the military on programs related to wellness, or health promotion and disease prevention. For example, the Air Force Surgeon General declared May 1984 the month to "Win with Wellness." Programs are being conducted this month throughout the Air Force to promote proper nutrition and exercise, reduce smoking, drug and alcohol abuse, and make personnel and their dependents more conscious of steps they can take to insure their health. The committee feels that such actions as these are a good first step. However, the committee is concerned that the wellness program has not been given high enough priority thus far and is concerned that the wellness program has great untapped potential for reducing military health care costs.

The United States Surgeon General's Report on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, "Healthy People," sets forth the national program for improving the health of Americans. The Surgeon General in his report made specific reference to the military as an area where there is an "opportunity for action." The committee agrees and, therefore, directs that the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services convene a "Blue Ribbon Panel" of public health experts to assess the present level of activity in the Armed Services on these issues and to make recommendations on how current programs of health promotion and disease prevention for military personnel and their dependents can be expanded and improved. The committee directs that the Panel's findings be submitted to the Congress by March 1, 1985.

TITLE I, PART F—PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SEC. 171, FLAG AND GENERAL OFFICER CEILING

In March 1982, the Department of Defense submitted to Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to change the management of flag and general officers. However, neither the House nor the Senate Committee on Armed Services has yet had an opportunity to formally consider the proposal. In the meantime, the Defense Department has continued to operate under a statutory ceiling which authorizes it no more than 1,073 flag and general officers. The ceiling became effective on October 1, 1981.

While the comprehensive legislative proposal is pending, the committee recognizes that the ceiling may impose undesirable mission and officer management hardships. Therefore, the committee recommends that the 1,073 ceiling be replaced by a ceiling of 1,100 to be effective through September 30, 1985. This relief is only meant to provide a reasonable margin within which the Services may operate while awaiting enactment of comprehensive flag and general officer legislation. The committee specifically intends that this increase of 27 in the ceiling should not result in the authorization of back pay or earlier dates of rank for those flag and general officers frocked under the 1,073 ceiling.

The number of lieutenant generals/vice admirals and generals/admirals in each Service is derived from a statutory formula based on a Service's total number of flag and general officers. The authorization of 27 additional flag and general officers in section 171 will yield several three- and four-star spaces in which the committee is very interested.

First, the higher ceiling of 1,100 will allow the Navy one additional space in the grade of vice admiral. During fiscal years 1983 and 1984, however, the Navy has been authorized three more vice admirals than would be produced by the statutory formula under the 1,073 ceiling. Because the Navy's need for these three three-star positions still exists, the committee recommends that the two positions not yielded by the increase to the 1,100 ceiling be specially authorized through September 30, 1985.

Second, although the increase in the ceiling will provide it one additional lieutenant general, the Marine Corps will still be lacking the three-star authorization it may require if a Marine general officer is selected as the next Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Central Command. The committee believes that a Marine officer should not be excluded from consideration for this important position simply because the Marine Corps does not have the necessary three-star spaces. Therefore, the committee proposes that the Marine Corps be authorized one additional lieutenant general during any period of fiscal year 1985 when a Marine lieutenant general commands the U.S. Central Command.

Third, the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98-94) authorized one additional officer in the grade of general for the Air Force. Because the 1,100 ceiling will yield an additional Air Force general, it is not necessary that the committee renew this special authorization beyond the end of fiscal year 1984.

The special authorization of two Navy vice admirals and one contingent Marine Corps lieutenant general does not increase the total number of flag and general officers beyond the 1,100 ceiling. Instead, it simply permits the Navy and Marine Corps to designate three more of their flag and general officers in the grades of vice admiral and lieutenant general within the 1,100 ceiling.

SEC. 172, MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act included statutory language requiring an overall reduction of 5 percent in the total number of personnel assigned to management headquarters and management headquarters support activities from the level requested in the fiscal year 1984 budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and certain intelligence activities were exempted from this reduction. The Conference Report accompanying the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act stipulated that this reduction would be allocated by the Secretary of Defense with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) allocated an "equitable proportion" of this reduction.

The committee's review indicates that the implementation of the 5-percent reduction in management headquarters staffing during fiscal year 1984 has been rather uneven across the Department of Defense. For example, although the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Conference Report stipulated that OSD should take an "equitable proportion" of the headquarters reduction in fiscal year 1984, OSD currently plans to implement this reduction in a manner that will result in a fiscal year 1984 end strength for OSD that is 4 percent higher than was originally requested in the fiscal year 1984 budget. All of the reductions in management headquarters made by the Army were little more than accounting changes. The Army simply took people assigned to management headquarters activities and reassigned them and their functions elsewhere.

The fiscal year 1985 budget request for the Department of Defense includes 76,250 military and civilian personnel assigned to management headquarters and management headquarters support activities.

In order to keep up the pressure on the Department of Defense to reduce duplicative and unnecessary overhead functions, and in order to increase the number of military and civilian personnel in operating activities at the expense of administrative activities, the committee recommends a provision (section 172) mandating another 5-percent reduction in management headquarters and management headquarters support functions in the Department of Defense from the level requested in the fiscal year 1985 President's budget. The provision also puts a ceiling of 1,696 on the personnel strength of OSD, which is the level originally requested in the fiscal year 1984 budget. As in last year's provision, JCS and certain intelligence functions would be exempt from this reduction.

In carrying out this 5-percent reduction in management headquarters and management headquarters support functions, it is the committee's intent that the civilian and military spaces freed up as a result of this reduction should be reassigned from administrative and overhead functions to actual operating activities. Functional realignments or changes in the criteria of what constitutes a management headquarters or management headquarters support function should not be employed to meet the reduction mandated by this section.

The committee's recommendation will result in a reduction of approximately 3,796 to the 76,250 personnel assigned to management headquarters and management headquarters support functions.

SEC. 173, AUTHORITY TO CONSIDER CERTAIN ARMY RESERVE GENERAL OFFICERS IN INACTIVE STATUS FOR PROMOTION

The committee has learned of a situation in which the Army may be precluded from considering highly qualified reserve general officers for promotion. Army reserve general officers generally agree to serve a 4-year tenure in a position for which they are selected. Section 3375 of title 10, United States Code, provides that within 30 days after a reserve general officer ceases to serve in a position commensurate with his grade, the Secretary of the Army must, as the officer elects, transfer the officer to the Retired Reserve, transfer him to inactive status, discharge him from his general officer appointment and reappoint him in the reserve grade held before his appointment as a general officer, or discharge him from his reserve appointment. At the same time, section 3364(e) of title 10, United States Code, provides that a reserve commissioned officer who has been in inactive status may not be considered for promotion until as least 1 year after he returns to an active status.

An example of the practical results of these sections of law is as follows. A reserve officer is appointed to the grade of brigadier general and agrees to serve a 4-year tenure in a position commensurate with that grade. Upon completion of that four year tenure, if he has not been already selected for promotion to major general or if another appropriate general officer position is not then open, he must be retired, be placed in inactive status, revert to his lower reserve grade, or be discharged, within 30 days. In the case of officers who wish to remain in the reserves, the normal result is being placed in inactive status. However, once he is placed in that status, he may not be considered for promotion until 1 year after returning to active status.

The committee is concerned that some highly qualified and motivated reserve general officers could be denied the opportunity for further service solely by virtue of the timing of their service in one position and the timing of openings for further service.

Therefore, the committee has included provisions granting the Secretary of the Army the authority to waive the requirement of section 3364(e) of title 10, United States Code, in the case of a reserve general officer who is in inactive status solely as a result of his being transferred to that status pursuant to section 3375 of title 10, United States Code, and provided such officer has been in inactive status for less than 1 year. These provisions should permit the Secretary of the Army greater flexibility in managing reserve general officers and give the Army the opportunity to utilize those highly motivated general officers who might otherwise be lost from the reserves.

SEC. 174, ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE FOR PERSONS SEPARATED FROM SERVICE ACADEMIES

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the authority of a Secretary of a military department to order a person separated from a Service academy to active duty.

Sections 4348, 6959, and 9348 of title 10, United States Code, authorize the Service Secretaries to order a person to active duty if he has not fulfilled his agreement to complete a Service academy's course of instruction. The Secretaries can exercise this authority, "unless (the individual is) sooner separated."

A decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has cast doubt on the effectiveness of the Secretaries' authority. In *Dougherty* v. *Lehman,* 688, F. 2d 158 (3d. Cir. 1982), the court decided that the phrase "unless sooner separated" referred to separation from a service academy rather than from a Service. Therefore, under the court's decision, if a person is separated from an academy, he could not be ordered to active duty.

The committee would like to clarify Congress' intent in granting the Service Secretaries this authority. It has proposed a provision which would amend sections 4348, 6959, and 9348 to make it clear that the phrase "unless sooner separated" applies to separation from a Service and not to separation from an academy.

SEC. 175, TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO SECTION 1022 OF FISCAL YEAR 1984 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 98–94) CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY TO INCREASE THE INITIAL TIME OF SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

In the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98–94) the Congress gave the Secretary of Defense discretionary authority to increase the military service obligation from 6 to not less than 6 nor more than 8 years.

Section 175 of the bill recommended by the committee makes conforming corrections to title 10, United States Code, to insure that the extension of the military service obligation passed by the Congress last year conforms to the congressional intent and applies to all classes of military personnel. This section gives the Secretary of Defense discretionary authority to extend the military service obligation of ROTC scholarship officers and graduates of the military Service academies from 6 to not less than 6 nor more than 8 years.

SEC. 176, EXTENSION OF NAVY SPOT PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to temporarily promote certain Navy lieutenants to lieutenant commander. Individuals promoted under this "spot" authority are line lieutenants who possess skills for which there is a critical shortage. In addition, they must serve in positions which are designated to be held by lieutenant commanders and are in need of the skills possessed by the person to be promoted. Under current Secretarial regulations, this authority is used only for ship and submarine engineering positions.

Although the Navy is attempting to enhance other incentives for engineering duty, its spot promotion authority remains an important tool for filling engineering positions aboard ships and submarines. Therefore, the committee recommends that this authority be extended for 2 years beyond its current expiration date of September 30, 1984. Promotions made under this authority would continue to be subject to the grade ceilings for lieutenant commanders set forth in subsection 523(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 177, APPOINTMENT OF PODIATRISTS AS MEDICAL OFFICERS

The committee has included provisions authorizing the appointment of doctors of podiatric medicine as members of the Medical Corps of the Army and of the Navy and with a view to designation as a medical officer of the Air Force. Doctors of podiatric medicine are presently assigned to the Medical Service Corps in the Army and Navy and the Biomedical Science Corps of the Air Force. These provisions will permit doctors of podiatric medicine to compete for promotion and career assignments with their colleagues and with those in other medical and surgical disciplines. They presently must compete against officers in medical support fields in which administrative and logistical skills are of primary importance.

Doctors of podiatric medicine are professionally trained and licensed to diagnose and treat conditions of the human foot by medical and surgical means. The first 2 years of podiatric medical school are identical to those of a general medical school program. The third and fourth years, which clinically concentrate on the lower extremeties, are fully integrated with general medical instruction. As a result, a doctor of podiatric medicine is required to possess knowledge and skills which could and should be utilized to the fullest extent possible, especially during periods of emergency or war.

Additionally, since only a medical doctor can legally duplicate the medical and surgical services performed by a doctor of podiatric medicine, a greater role for doctors of podiatric medicine in the military medical community should permit better utilization of the military's limited supply of medical doctors, especially surgeons. For example, if doctors of podiatric medicine are not available to perform foot surgery, medical doctors, quite often specialists in orthopedic medicine, must be utilized for that purpose.

Because there presently is no shortage of doctors of podiatric medicine entering the armed forces and because it is believed that by permitting these officers to be appointed as medical officers the retention of these officers will be improved, the committee has included provisions excluding doctors of podiatric medicine from being paid the special pay authorized by section 302 of title 37, United States Code, which is authorized for other medical officers.

SEC. 178, TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO PROVISIONS OF LAW ENACTED BY THE DEFENSE OFFICER PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT ACT

The committee has included provisions making technical changes in seven areas to provisions enacted by the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) (Public Law 96-513). Each of these provisions corrects a technical deficiency in the existing provisions; no substantive changes are included.

The first of these provisions would amend section 645 of title 10, United States Code, by deleting the rule which eliminates from the promotion zone an officer who has been removed from a promotion list. Under existing law, an officer who is selected for promotion from below the zone, is removed from the promotion list for cause, and would normally be eligible for consideration by the next selection board based on his date of rank being within the zone, does not fall within the present definition of below the zone, in the zone, or above the zone. This provision would provide that such an officer is in the zone.

The second provision would amend section 680(b)(3) of title 10 to insert the term "separation pay", which was inadvertently omitted when DOPMA was enacted. Section 680(b)(3) lists some of the conditions under which a Reservist who is released from active duty prior to the expiration of an active duty agreement is not entitled to separation pay. That section presently provides that eligibility for retired pay or severance pay under other provisions of law are such conditions. Eligibility for separation pay under other provisions of law would be added to this list of circumstances.

The third provision would amend section 3964 and 8964 of title 10, United States Code, by striking the word "temporary" from those sections. Those sections presently permit a warrant officer or enlisted member to be advanced to the highest temporary grade satisfactorily held when his active service plus service on the retired list equals 30 years. DOPMA eliminated temporary grades, except in time of war or national emergency. By eliminating the term "temporary" from these sections, the member could be advanced to the highest grade held, whether temporary or permanent.

The fourth provision would amend sections 4336 and 9336 of title 10, relating to the promotion of permanent professors and the Director of Admissions at the United States Military Academy and the Air Force Academy, respectively, to correct an inadvertent error resulting from the provisions of DOPMA. Prior to DOPMA, an officer serving as a permanent professor or Director of Admissions was promoted to the permanent grade of colonel when he completed 6 years of service in the position or when an officer junior to him on the promotion list was promoted to colonel. Since DOPMA eliminated the promotion list and replaced it with the active duty list, the language in sections 4336 and 9336 was changed to provide that the officer would be promoted when another officer junior to him on the active-duty list is promoted to the grade of colonel. The problem is that prior to DOPMA, there were no below the zone promotions on the promotion list and officers were promoted to permanent colonel at about 23 years of service. Presently, officers on the active duty list can be promoted to colonel from below the zone with approximately 15 years of service. If the language currently in sections 4336 and 9336 were followed, it could result in an unintended windfall for these officers, since they could be promoted when the first officer junior to them on the active duty list is promoted from below the zone. The proposed amendment would substitute language which would permit promotion of the officer after 6 years in the position or after the date on which he would have been promoted had he been selected for promotion and promoted from within the promotion zone. This eliminates the potential windfall and preserves the intent of the law that an officer who accepts such a position not be penalized for promotion in relationship to his former contemporaries.

The fifth provision amends section 5891(c) of title 10 to delete references to placement on a "lineal list" before promotion of a Naval or Marine Corps Reserve Officer. With the enactment of DOPMA, lineal lists were replaced by active duty lists. The provision would merely replace references to lineal lists with references to active duty lists.

The sixth provision would repeal section 6482 of title 10, which authorizes the recall of retired regular enlisted members of the Navy or Marine Corps in time of war or national emergency. DOPMA added section 688 of title 10, which is a common statute applying to the recall of all retired regular members of the armed forces in time of war or national emergency. Section 6482 is, therefore, no longer needed.

The seventh provision would amend section 404(c)(1) of title 37, United States Code, to add to that section a reference to separation pay, which was inadvertently omitted from that section at the time of enactment of DOPMA. Section 404(c) of title 37 relates to the selection of a home for purposes of travel and transportation allowances by certain categories of personnel. Presently, those categories include persons discharged immediately following at least 8 years of continuous active duty with severance pay or released from active duty under the same conditions with readjustment pay. DOPMA provided provisions for the payment of separation pay under similar circumstances. The provisions would merely include in the category of persons covered by section 404(c), those receiving separation pay.

DRUG ABUSE TESTING PROGRAM

In the late 1970's, the problem of use of illegal drugs within the military had become a matter of the gravest concern for the Services, for this committee, and for the Nation as a whole.

In August 1981, the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology (AFIP) developed a procedure with the capability for mass testing of urine for indicators of the presence of marihuana, by far the most widely abused drug. In December 1981, the Deputy Secretary of Defense implemented a policy under which the Services were authorized to take disciplinary action under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and to characterize administrative discharges based upon evidence developed by urinalysis testing.

Although the AFIP-developed procedures had been given relatively little field testing under mass processing situations, in February 1982 the Navy announced its all-out efforts to rid the Navy of drug abuse through the use of mass urinalysis testing. The other Services began mass urinalysis testing soon thereafter. The committee fully supported those decisions at the time they were made and that support has not wavered. However, because of the sudden onslaught of thousands of test specimens, the Department of Defense laboratory system became overloaded, response time back to the field slowed, and it became more and more difficult to insure that the exacting procedures required to properly conduct the testing were being followed.

In response to these problems, the Army and Air Force sought permission to establish a separate laboratory system. That request was approved and was implemented in October 1982. That system consists of four drug testing laboratories located throughout the world.

Mass urinalysis testing for drugs within the Armed Services has been the single most powerful weapon the Services have found to combat drug abuse and there is no doubt about the tremendous favorable impact it has had on the problem. In the field, both commanding officers and individual soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines attest to the fact that drug abuse has been substantially reduced. This first-hand knowledge of personnel in the field is supported by self-reported statistical data compiled by the Department of Defense. While the problem certainly has not been eradicated, there is no question that the success of the armed forces in addressing and combating the problem has been admirable. The trends created by these past successes must not be allowed to slow or abate.

The committee is tremendously concerned that on-going problems and recurring, but unanswered, questions about the procedures utilized to account for the chain of custody of urine specimens and the manner in which the chemical testing procedures are actually carried out could have that result. The types of problems that have been identified in this testing program undermine the confidence of commanders and others in positions of responsibility in the reliability of the program, leading to questions about whether they should initiate criminal or administrative actions against individual members based solely on test results. They undermine the confidence of the individual military member in the fairness of the program. And in the worst case, these problems could lead to a person being convicted of a crime by a court-martial based on evidence which may be less than reliable.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense undertake an immediate review of the drug testing programs presently in place in the Services. This review shall include a review of chain of custody procedures in each Service, the procedures utilized in conducting the actual testing of urine samples, and the criteria utilized in analyzing the results of that testing. Furthermore, because the committee is aware that many of the scientific and legal questions that have been raised about the actual testing can be resolved through the use of gas chromatography/mass spectrometry procedures, the review should address whether these procedures should be required before adverse actions are initiated against personnel. A copy of that review, along with the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense resulting from that review, shall be transmitted to the committee before October 1, 1984.

OVERSIGHT OF MILITARY CONFINEMENT SYSTEM

The committee continues to receive numerous complaints and inquires about various apparent disparities and procedures within the military confinement system.

Under the military justice system, the court-martial which tried, convicted, and sentenced a military member to confinement has no continuing jurisdiction over that member after a sentence is announced. Therefore, if a military member believes that he is being wronged in the manner in which he is being required to undergo a sentence to confinement imposed by a court-martial, the member may not seek relief from that court-martial. Furthermore, he may not seek relief from any other trial level judicial body within the military justice system. While it may be possible to seek some extraordinary relief from either a Court of Military Review or the Court of Military Appeals, there is a question, at least, about the scope of authority of those courts to act in cases as a judicial body of first impression.

The committee is concerned that there may be insufficient connection between the processes under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. et seq.) by which a military member may be sentenced to confinement and the subsequent processes under which that member may be required to serve that sentence. It is clear that even the most fair and most just pretrial, trial, and post trial appellate procedures could be undermined if the subsequent confinement procedures are not designed or administered in a fair and just manner.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to conduct a study of the post trial confinement procedures in effect in the armed services. The study should address, among other things, the procedures utilized by the Services for determining if persons sentenced to confinement should be paroled, should have their sentences shortened, and under what conditions these persons will serve their sentence to confinement. Differences in these procedures among the Services should be addressed and explained. The study should also address issues concerning the due process afforded confined individuals in actions concerning changes in confinement conditions or confinement status. A copy of that study shall be furnished to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than February 1, 1985.

INDEPENDENCE OF MILITARY DEFENSE COUNSEL

In April 1972, then Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird established the task force on the Administration of Military Justice in the armed forces, composed of both military personnel and civilians from both the public and private sectors, and commissioned that task force to perform a wide ranging study on the military justice system. On November 30, 1972, that task force forwarded its report to the Secretary of Defense. On January 11, 1973, the Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum to the Secretaries of the military departments directing that certain actions should be initiated immediately in response to the findings and recommendations of the task force. Included in those directed actions was the following:

> The Military Departments are directed to submit plans to revise the structure of the Judge Advocate organizations to place defense counsel under the authority of the Judge Advocate General, and in the case of the Marine Corps, under the Director, Judge Advocate Division.

This action was based, at least in part, on the fact that at that time judge advocates serving as defense counsel served under the direction and control of more senior attorneys who usually were the legal counsel to the commanding officer responsible for convening courts-martial and referring cases to those courts-martial for trial. Those same supervisory attorneys were responsible for the supervision of the prosecution of these cases referred to trial. This situation had contributed to a perception, at least, that defense counsel were controlled by the parties responsible for the prosecution of the individuals these counsel were defending.

In response to this direction from the Secretary of Defense, the Army and Air Force have established separate defense counsel activities within the Judge Advocate organizations in which the supervision and and control of defense counsel in the field flows directly from the Judge Advocate General headquarters through supervisory defense counsel to those individual defense counsel. These programs have proven to be extremely successful in overcoming the perception that defense counsel may have to split their loyalty between their clients and those responsible for prosecution of those clients. Furthermore, these programs now have become recognized by commanders to be valuable and appropriate means to help insure individual military members that the military justice system is fully committed to providing members accused of crimes truly independent defense counsel.

During the past year, the Navy has conducted a test program at one location of utilizing a separate defense counsel activity. The Marine Corps has recently undertaken a study of the issue of whether a separate defense activity should be established within the Marine Corps.

The committee is vitally interested in the continued fair and efficient administration of the military justice system and believes that the ongoing test program in the Navy and the ongoing study in the Marine Corps will be valuable to the committee in its oversight of that system. The committee therefore directs that the Secretary of the Navy transmit to the committee, not later than February 1, 1985, a report concerning the Navy's test program and the Marine Corps study, including any recommendations the Secretary may have concerning the establishment of separate defense counsel activities in the Navy and Marine Corps.

CULTURAL ORIENTATION FOR U.S. MILITARY MEMBERS STATIONED OVERSEAS

Our national commitments require the United States to maintain a large military presence in a number of foreign countries. In some overseas areas, the U.S. military population represents a significant addition to the population of local communities. Therefore, it is important for U.S. military personnel serving overseas to have an understanding, sensitivity, and appreciation of the local customs and institutions of the communities in which they are stationed. A basic orientation in the language, culture and history of the host country is important for U.S. military personnel assigned overseas.

The committee has received recent reports that U.S. military personnel serving in local communities, particularly in Germany, are not as involved or integrated into local community life as they could be. The committee understands that this process is a two-way street and that the U.S. military forces cannot be expected to bear the full burden in this regard. However, the committee believes that more could and should be done to provide our military members in foreign countries more familiarity with language, history, customs, and institutions of the countries in which they are assigned.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by December 1, 1984, a report on the Department's current efforts to provide cultural orientation for U.S. military members stationed abroad and to recommend necessary actions to broaden and increase this orientation process. The Services should identify any necessary resources that might be needed in order to achieve the goal of better relations between U.S. military personnel serving overseas and the population of the communities where our service members are stationed.

SEC. 1002, OPERATION OF OVERSEAS SCHOOLS BY THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

The Department of Education Organization Act (Public Law 96–88) provided that administrative responsibility for the overseas schools of military dependents would be transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of Education. The transfer was originally scheduled to be accomplished no later than May 4, 1983 (3 years after the effective date of the Act). However, the fiscal year 1983 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 97–252) extended the deadline for the transfer by 1 year. That extension, in turn, was further lengthened by the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98–94) which provided that the transfer was not to take place any earlier than May 4, 1986.

For several years, the committee has strongly supported the continued operation of the overseas military schools by the Defense Department. Testimony by several organizations and individuals has made it clear that the more than 140,000 children enrolled in the overseas schools are receiving a very good education. Transferring responsibility for the schools' administration to the Education Department would not enhance an already excellent program of education. Instead, the committee believes that many fiscal, administrative, personnel, and military factors that have contributed to the schools' performance could be disrupted if they were transferred to the Department of Education. These practical considerations were discussed in detail in the committee's report on the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act.

The most important testimony and information that the committee has received on this issue have been from those who are most deeply involved in the daily operation of the schools—parents and teachers. They have strongly supported the committee's efforts to repeal the transfer.

In order to confirm this view of the teachers' opinions, the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive survey. In the survey conducted on January 6, 1984, all classroom teachers, school nurses, guidance counselors, school psychologists, and social workers were asked whether the DOD overseas schools should be retained within the Defense Department or whether they should be transferred to the Education Department. Of the 7,614 ballots distributed to eligible teachers, a total of 6,794 (89.2 percent) valid ballots were returned for count. The results of the survey indicate that 5,130 (75.5 percent) voted for the retention of the schools in DOD and that 1,664 (24.5 percent) voted for the transfer to the Education Department. Therefore, the survey confirmed the committee's view that the overwhelming majority of teachers believe that their schools should continue to be administered by the Department of Defense. Moreover, their position is the same as that of the Defense Department, the Education Department, and the Overseas Federation of Teachers.

The House-Senate conferees on the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act expressed their concern "that the question of the transfer should be resolved as expeditiously as possible so that the uncertainty surrounding the transfer does not adversely affect the quality of education being provided". In an effort to resolve this issue, the committee again recommends that the scheduled transfer of DOD schools to the Department of Education be rescinded.

The initial part of the committee recommendation would amend the Department of Education Organization Act by repealing all those provisions related to the overseas dependents' schools system, its transfer and its planned administration by the Education Department. The second section would return the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education to the Department of Defense. Finally, the recommendation of the committee authorizes the Secretary of Defense to call upon the Secretary of Education for advice and technical support in the operation of the schools.

SEC. 1018, COAST GUARD MEMBERSHIP ON THE RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD

The committee recommends that the Coast Guard membership on the Reserve Forces Policy Board be increased from one to two.

Section 175 of title 10, United States Code, establishes the Reserve Forces Policy Board as the principal policy advisor to the Secretary of Defense on matters relating to the reserve components. Its membership consists of a civilian chairman, the Assistant Secretaries for Manpower from each of the military departments, a regular officer from each of the military departments, four reserve officers from each of the military departments, a regular or reserve Coast Guard officer, and an executive officer of the Board.

In order to enhance the Coast Guard's participation in the Board's activities and to make its representation more consistent with that of the other Services, the committee proposes a provision increasing Coast Guard membership from one to two officers.

SEC. 1004, GENDER CHANGE IN CRITERIA FOR DRAFT EXEMPTIONS

The committee recommends a minor change to the statutory criteria that determine draft exemptions.

Section 6(o) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (50 U.S.C. App. 456(o)) provides that no person may be involuntarily inducted if his father, brother, or sister were killed in action or died in the line of duty while serving in the armed forces. The same exemption from the draft exists during any period of time in which the father, brother, or sister is in a captured or missing status as a result of such service.

Because a large number of women are serving in the military, it is conceivable that the mother of a young man eligible for induction could die, be missing, or be captured in the line of duty. Therefore, in an effort to be consistent, the committee proposes to include the phrase "mother" in section 6(o) of the Act. The Director of the Selective Service System has advised the committee that he believes this change would be appropriate.

SEC. 1005, PROTECTION OF MARINE CORPS NAME AND INSIGNIA

It has been brought to the committee's attention that, with few exceptions, the names and insignia of the armed Services do not enjoy specific statutory protection from misuse in the commercial arena. Recently, the Marine Corps has found itself attempting to prevent its insignia and name from being utilized by a variety of commercial activities.

One party has attempted to register the Marine Corps emblem as a trademark; another is utilizing that emblem on authentic looking certificates. Another commercial organization calling itself the "The First Marine Band" has failed to pay its hotel bills which have been sent to the Marine Corps for payment. Other commercial enterprises have begun using the familiar initials of the Marine Corps, "USMC", on gasoline cans and artificial limbs which are sold primarily to military and veterans medical facilities. The Marine Corps has been deluged with complaints about these commercial usages and has attempted to stop those using its name, initials, or symbols in a manner likely to cause the public to believe that the Marine Corps is endorsing, selling, or otherwise associated with these commercial endeavors. However, because these names and symbols are not considered insignia of the United States and enjoy no statutory protection, the Marine Corps has not been totally successful in protecting the public from this misuse.

The committee, therefore, recommends a provision which would provide statutory protection to these names and symbols from deceptive uses. A provision similar to that recommended by the committee is already contained in section 191 of title 10, United States Code, for the protection of the name, initials, and seal of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

The committee intends that the protection afforded to Marine Corps indicia under its provision be utilized in a fair and commonsense manner. It is not designed to prohibit the use of words and symbols associated with the Marine Corps simply because the use may not be pleasing, but rather it is designed only to protect the public from uses likely to produce confusion about the association or involvement of the Marine Corps with private commercial goods and services.

Furthermore, the committee understands that the other Services are experiencing similar problems, but to a lesser degree. Therefore, the committee urges that this problem be fully reviewed within the Department of Defense and that the committee be advised if broader legislation, covering all the Services, is needed and appropriate.

TITLE I, PART G—CIVIL DEFENSE

The administration originally requested $252.48 million for the Nation's civil defense preparedness program in fiscal year 1985. The significant real growth over last year's enacted level was designed to enhance the ability of State and local jurisdictions to provide protection to their populations in the event of a wide range of possible emergencies.

In the administration's revised budget request, the funding request for civil defense was reduced to $190.48 million. This revised funding level provides for approximately 6 percent real growth in the civil defense program over fiscal year 1984. In accordance with the administration's action, the committee recommends that the sum of $190.48 million be provided for civil defense purposes in fiscal year 1985.

FISCAL YEAR 1985 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1984		Fiscal year 1985	
	Original request	Enacted	Original request	Revised request
State and local assistance	$141.44	$103.84	$140.90	$108.51
State and local emergency management	56.14	56.80	60.70	59.36
Radiological defense	19.90	10.30	20.00	10.76
Population protection	36.50	13.00	23.70	13.58
Protection of industrial capabilities		4.70	5.20	4.91
S&L direction, control and warning	28.90	19.04	31.30	19.90
Emergency planning assistance	78.70	36.24	78.10	51.07
Telecommunication and warning	42.40	15.24	49.90	27.82
Training and education	16.50	15.43	18.90	17.42
Research	20.00	5.57	9.30	5.83
Salaries and expenses	33.38	29.12	33.48	30.90
Total Civil Defense	253.52	169.20	252.48	190.48

TITLE I, PART H—DEFENSE PROCUREMENT IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 191, WEAPON SYSTEMS WARRANTIES

The committee has been concerned for many years about management approaches in DOD to assure that weapon systems will meet the military requirement for which they are designed and that such systems are manufactured to specifications with correct materials and high quality workmanship.

Failures of systems to achieve these goals in all situations may be the result of any number of problems. There is traditionally a large amount of concurrency in the development of a weapon system and initial production. Thus, production will commence well before a final design has been agreed upon between the Department and the contractor. It is argued that this concurrency is necessary, both to reduce the time involved in fielding systems and because of the inevitable changes necessary in a system as production lines are built and full scale production commences.

DOD has traditionally utilized varied tools to try to maximize the likelihood that weapons systems will function as intended and are correctly manufactured. The inspection and acceptance procedures are structured to do this. Testing is an important tool, and the Congress has sought to strengthen operational testing in DOD through the establishment of the position of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. Effective planning throughout the development stages is also critically important.

Some Members of Congress, particularly Senator Mark Andrews, have sought to address this set of concerns about reliable and effective weapon systems through a statutory requirement that all weapon systems be delivered to the United States with a materials and workmanship warranty and a performance guaranty. Senator Andrew's concept was enacted into law in 1983 as section 794 of Public Law 98-212, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984. The committee recognizes the importance of Senator Andrew's efforts in this area, and supports his effort to take reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that weapons systems operate properly and reliably.

The committee is concerned that a statutory requirement for contractual warranties and guarantees in virtually all cases may be too narrow an approach to a very complex problem. It is unlikely that contractual warranties alone can solve the problems of reliability and performance. DOD will obviously have to continue to utilize all of the management tools available to it to produce effective and reliable weapon systems.

Nevertheless, the committee is in accord with Senator Andrews that warranties and guarantees, when properly crafted and administered, have an appropriate place in the total effort to insure that the United States purchases effective weapons. When section 794 was being considered by the Senate, substantial concerns were expressed by both the Department of Defense and defense contractors that certain specific details of the particular provision might cause unforeseen problems. The Chairman of the committee apprised the Senate on November 8, 1983, of some of these potential problems in a floor statement made at the time the DOD Appropriations Act was passed.

The committee held a full day of hearings on the subject of warranties and guarantees on February 28, 1984. Senator Andrews was the lead witness at these hearings. DOD and eight outside witnesses also testified.

During the hearing, three major sets of problems with section 794 surfaced. First, the concern was expressed that the provision could have an adverse impact on the ability of small businesses to compete for defense contracts. Since section 794 would have required full warranties from subcontractors, there was a concern that some small businesses acting as subcontractors would not have had the financial strength to provide such a warranty. It was also felt that if performance guarantees were required on all production of weapons, including new systems, a prime contractor might plausibly insist on furnishing all spare parts and maintenance for the life of the system. This would obviously be anti-competitive and would have undermined the breakout programs which have been so strongly endorsed by the Congress.

Second, there was great concern that an insistence upon performance guarantees for the initial production of a new weapons system would have undesirable effects. Because of the difficulty of assessing the certainty that a new system will meet all performance requirements, as required in section 794, a contractor might demand a very high price to give a performance guarantee on initial production of a new system. Such a demand might be reasonable in light of the rigid remedies in section 794, effectively requiring that the contractor eventually provide a system which met the guarantee, regardless of the corrective costs involved. This open-ended exposure for contractors, even when the basic capabilities of a new system had not been demonstrated, seemed to invite prices for performance guarantees that could exceed reasonable amounts for the United States to pay.

In the event that the United States was simply unwilling to pay the amounts which might be required by contractors for performance guarantees on new systems, the committee was concerned that there would then be an inevitable negotiation downward of the performance specifications so as to reduce the risk for the contractor and ensure that the modified performance requirements could be met. This was also an undesirable result. Since the defense posture of the United States is based significantly on technical superiority, an incentive to compromise the capabilities of weapon systems would be a serious public policy error.

Third, the committee recognized that a contractor for DOD never controls all aspects of the design of a weapon system. In some cases, many aspects of the design may be directed by the government. In other cases, such as dual source procurement, a contractor may be asked to build a system to the design specifications of another company. Notwithstanding the lack of control over design, section 794 would have imposed on the contractor liability for failures of a design to meet certain performance requirements. The committee was concerned that this situation raised fundamental questions of equity, and may have created situations inconsistent with general principles of American law that liability should be associated with some fault.

The committee has attempted through a relatively modest set of adjustments to section 794 to remedy these and related problems. The committee provision would rescind section 794 and substitute for it a permanent provision of law to be included in title 10 of the United States Code.

Subsection (a) sets forth the definitions of seven terms utilized in the section. Subsection (a)(1) defines weapon system or other defense equipment as items that can be used directly by the armed forces to carry out combat missions. In addition, it establishes a test for coverage by this provision. Only systems which on a per unit basis cost more than $100,000, or for which the eventual total procurement is more than $10 million, are covered. This definition, other than the cost limitations, is very similar to that issued by the Department in its guidance on section 794.

Subsection (a)(2) defines a prime contractor as a party that has entered into an agreement directly with the United States to furnish part or all of the weapons system or other defense equipment.

Subsection (a)(3) defines design and manufacturing requirements as the structural and engineering plans, and manufacturing particulars, setting forth precise measurements, tolerances, materials, processes, and in-process and finished product tests for the weapons system and other defense equipment.

Subsection (a)(4) defines essential performance requirements as the operating capabilities or maintenance and reliability characteristics of a weapons system or other defense equipment that are determined by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary for the system or equipment to fulfill the military requirement for which it was designed.

Subsection (a)(5) defines component as any constituent element of a weapon system or other defense equipment. The term is defined for purposes of this provision, and does not necessarily conform with traditional use of the term in DOD procurement.

Subsection (a)(6) defines mature full scale production. Such production means the manufacture of all units of a weapon system or other defense equipment after the manufacture of either the first 10 percent of the eventual total production of such system or equipment or the initial production quantity, whichever is less.

Subsection (a)(7) defines initial production quantity as the number of units of a weapon system or other defense equipment contracted for in the first year of full scale production.

Subsection (b) of the committee's provision is a general requirement that DOD obtain performance guarantees and materials and workmanship warranties on weapon systems and other defense equipment. The section is codified in title 10 of the United States Code and is a provision of permanent law. The items covered by this provision are set forth in subsection (a)(1), which defines weapon system and other defense equipment. The inclusion of other defense equipment in this provision is intended to enlarge the types of equipment covered by warranties as compared with section 794. This provision will apply to contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the Act.

There obviously are some contracts which have been negotiated under the terms of section 794. Contractual provisions or guarantees in those agreements should not be disturbed by this change of law.

It should be emphasized, as clearly stated in subsection (g)(6), that the standards of this section are minimum standards. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to utilize his full discretionary administrative authority to negotiate warranties or guarantees broader or more demanding that those required in this law, where the Secretary determines that such contract provisions are appropriate. The omission of certain systems from the statutory provision, or certain limitations on the warranties referred to in the statute, is in no way intended to evidence any congressional preference for the warranty described in the statute rather than a more demanding warranty. The committee believes that the statutory requirement should set forth a minimum standard.

The committee provision applies only to weapon systems or other defense equipment furnished by a prime contractor or prime contractors. The statute requires that whenever the United States contracts for items covered by the law, it obtain the warranties and guarantees described from the prime contractor or contractors. In situations where there may be numerous prime contractors on a single weapon system, each of which is furnishing its products directly to the United States, it is anticipated that each contractor in privity with the United States would furnish the required warranties and guarantees to the government.

The committee has deleted the provisions of section 794 that dealt with other contractors (presumably subcontractors) and components of systems. Traditionally in major systems contracting, the prime contractor has assumed the responsibility for the total system and has then obtained from subcontractors appropriate warranties. The committee believes that this system is sound and that it would become administratively unworkable if the United States were expected to obtain warranties or guarantees from hundreds of subcontractors on a typical weapon system. The committee anticipates that, to the extent warranties are provided by the prime contractor to the government, the prime contractor will, in turn, obtain warranties from its subcontractors.

Subsection (b)(1) requires a guarantee that the system or equipment conforms to the design and manufacturing requirements, as defined in subsection (a)(3), and to the essential performance requirements, as defined in subsection (a)(4), as specifically delineated in the production contract or any amendments thereto. The conformity with design and manufacturing requirements is a guarantee requirement in addition to those in section 794. It is intended to ensure that contractors build systems to specifications. The performance guarantee has been modified from that in section 794 to statutorily require guarantees on essential performance requirements. This change is intended to clarify that DOD may designate certain types of performance characteristics as non-essential, or as goals or objectives, and remove such characteristics from the statutory requirement. The committee intends, however, that all operating capabilities and maintenance and reliability characteristics of the system or equipment which are necessary for it to fulfill the military requirement for which it is designed be agreed upon with the contractor and subject to the performance guarantee. The committee is also aware that the General Accounting Office, in its report to Senator Ted Stevens dated April 24, 1984, dealing with certain aspects of the DOD guidance on section 794 (hereinafter "GAO Report"), found that DOD under section 794 had the discretion to segregate certain nonessential performance requirements from those it deemed essential. (GAO Report at 16.) This provision is, therefore, consistent with the GAO interpretation of the operative effect of section 794.

Section (b)(2) is a standard materials and workmanship warranty. In section 794, this provision had tied materials and workmanship defects to performance. The committee believes that the statute will be more easily understood and implemented if this section is a straightforward requirement for a guarantee that the system or equipment, at the time it was delivered to the United States, was free from all defects in materials and workmanship. During the February 28 hearing before the committee, it was unanimously agreed that it is sound public policy for the United States to seek materials and workmanship warranties on weapon systems. This subsection covers that particular requirement.

Subsection (b)(3) establishes the minimum remedies in the event that a system or item of equipment fails to meet the guarantees or warranties provided to the government. The committee believes that this provision is most workable if the Secretary of Defense is given discretion to select among several remedies. In this way, the Secretary can utilize the most appropriate remedy under the circumstances. Since weapon systems and defense equipment are deployed worldwide—on land, at sea, and in space—the committee concluded that the identification of a single remedy as the preferred remedy in all cases would be unrealistic, since such a remedy could be unworkable in a number of situations.

The first remedy, as set forth in subsection (b)(3)(A), is that the contractor promptly take such corrective action as necessary to correct the failure. This corrective action is to be taken at no additional cost to the United States. The committee believes that in all situations where the contractor is prepared to promptly remedy the breach of guarantee, the contractor should be given the opportunity to do so. The committee recognizes, however, that in many situations such prompt contractor repair is impossible. For example, the committee is not aware of any way in which a contractor could promptly repair defects in systems that are deployed aboard ships at sea.

The committee anticipates that the Department will use its administrative discretion to establish guidelines regarding interpretations of promptness. Obviously, promptness will vary under the circumstances, but the Department is entitled to utilize a standard that will permit it to meet operational requirements. For example, if the only means a contractor has available for the repair of a system is return of the system to a contractor facility, the Department may determine whether the time involved in the transportation associated with such repair is sufficiently prompt to meet operational requirements. If the Department determines that prompt repair is not possible, or if the contractor fails to make a prompt repair, the Department may resort to other remedies.

The scope of the corrective work required of the contractor in subsection (b)(3)(A) is much broader than that in section 794. Under this provision, it is anticipated that the contractor would take any and all types of action necessary to correct any breach of the guarantees offered. This provision should eliminate the concern in the GAO Report about whether certain types of corrective action could be required. (GAO Report at pp. 8–11.)

The remedy in subsection (b)(3)(A) also requires that there be no additional cost to the United States for the required repairs. This language is intended to clearly permit the United States to impose on the contractor all costs associated with the repair, such as transportation of a part to and from a repair facility. This should clarify related issues posed by the GAO. (GAO Report at pp. 11-13.)

The second remedy, as set forth in subsection (b)(3)(B), is for the contractor to reimburse the United States for costs incurred by the government to correct the particular failure. The committee recognizes that in many circumstances it will be impractical for the contractor to repair defective equipment. Under such circumstances, the only option available to the United States to achieve the value of any guarantee for which it has paid would be to make the repair itself and to be reimbursed for some or all costs incurred. It is anticipated that under these circumstances the United States would be reasonable in the amount of resources utilized for a particular repair and that the costs incurred and to be reimbursed by the contractor would be reasonable costs under the circumstances.

In addition, it is the committee's intention to permit the Secretary of Defense to accept a payment from a contractor which would be less than the full amount of the costs incurred in the repair. The Department has indicated to the committee that there are circumstances where an assessment against the contractor of the full amount of repair would not be equitable, and the Department has indicated a desire to have the flexibility to accept a smaller amount where appropriate. Equitable adjustment is a traditional DOD contract mechanism, and the committee believes that it can be appropriately utilized in the administration of guarantees and warranties.

No part of subsection (b)(3) is intended to prevent the Secretary of Defense from negotiating contracts that may utilize more severe remedies. This is further clarified in subsection (g)(6). If, for example, the Secretary determines in a particular contract that the recovery of incidental or consequential damages in the event of a guarantee breach is appropriate, the statute is not intended to foreclose his authority to negotiate contracts including such broader remedies. In clarifying this point, the committee takes no position on the question of whether it would be appropriate or desirable for any such broader remedies to be utilized.

Subsection (c)(1) is a general exemption from the application of the provision for government furnished equipment (GFE). The committee recognizes that it would be inequitable to hold a prime contractor liable for faults in any GFE which is integrated into a weapons system. The committee determined, however, that the contractor should be responsible for the correct installation of GFE, and for ensuring that any warranty provided to the government on GFE is not invalidated through prime contractor action during installation. This point is clarified in subsection (g)(3).

Subsection (c)(2) is the combat damage exemption carried over from section 794.

Subsections (d) and (e) deal with the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive some or all of the requirements of this section. Subsection (d) permits a waiver of all warranty requirements described in subsection (b) if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary in the interest of national defense or that the guarantee required under subsection (b) would not be cost-effective.

As a general principle, a waiver provision in a statute is often viewed as being an extraordinary mechanism, a device which is intended to be used only under particularly unusual circumstances. The committee believes that the cost-effectiveness standard in subsection (d) is not intended only for extraordinary situations, but rather as an indication to the Department that it should generally obtain guarantees only when they are cost-effective.

In the committee's view, cost-effectiveness can usually only be determined after negotiations with the contractor. The committee expects the Department to negotiate conscientiously to try to arrive at a warranty or guarantee that will be cost-effective. However, if the Department is convinced that the equitable cost of guarantee would probably exceed the benefits of such guarantee, then the Department may elect not to incorporate into the contract the type of guarantee required by this provision.

The committee has also slightly modified the notification procedures that had been established in section 794. Subsection (e) requires the Secretary to notify the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of an intention to waive the requirements of this section only in the case of major defense acquisition programs, as that term is defined in 10 USC § 139a. Though the statute does not specify a particular time period for notification, the committee would expect to be notified 30 days in advance of the issuance of a waiver. Waivers for programs that are not major defense acquisition programs would be aggregated and transmitted to the committees annually, not later than February 1 for the prior calendar year. This change in reporting requirements is intended to reduce the administrative burden on the Department. In either case, the notifications to the committees must set forth the reasons for any waiver granted or proposed.

The issue has arisen since the enactment of section 794 about the desirability and appropriateness of waivers for groups of systems or contracts. The Department has issued two such class waivers, one upon enactment for all systems, and one on March 14, 1984, for systems covered by cost-type contracts. The committee is aware that the GAO determined that the issuance of class waivers under section 794 is permissible. (GAO Report at 5–6.) The committee considered withdrawing this authority, but concluded that there may be rare circumstances where a class waiver is proper. In most cases, however, waivers should be issued with respect to specific contracts or specific equipment. The committee intends that DOD not use class waivers other than in unusual circumstances where it can be clearly shown that such an approach is consistent with the statute and the underlying legislative intent. The committee is aware that the GAO has questioned the appropriateness of the particular class waiver for cost-type contracts. (GAO Report at 6–7.) While the question of the validity of this waiver is one that depends upon the particular facts, the committee believes that the types of concerns raised by GAO are illustrative of the matters which the Department should consider before issuing any further class waivers.

Subsection (f) provides an important restriction regarding the application of the guarantees set forth in subsection (b)(1). A provision has been added to statutorily require the guarantees of subsection (b)(1)—guarantee of essential performance requirements and conformance with design and manufacturing requirements—only when a system is in mature full scale production. Mature full scale production is defined in subsection (a)(6). Thus, the committee would impose no statutory requirement that the subsection (b)(1) guarantees be provided on the first 10-percent of the production of a system. The 10-percent level is further limited to the initial production quantity.

The following chart illustrates the application to two hypothetical weapon systems:

	A	B
Eventual total production	400	7,000
Initial production quantity	65	90
Maximum level of production for which subsection (b)(1) guarantee not required	[1] 40	[2] 90

[1] When one-tenth of eventual total production is less than the initial production quantity, the one-tenth, or in this case 40, is the maximum level of production for which the subsection (b)(1) guarantee is not required.

[2] When the initial production quantity is less than one-tenth of eventual total production, then the initial production quantity, or in this case 90, is less than the maximum level of production for which the subsection (b)(1) guarantee is not required.

It should be made clear, however, that a warranty on materials and workmanship as provided in subsection (b)(2) is required on all units. Moreover, the Secretary has the discretion to require the subsection (b)(1) warranty if he should elect to do so, based upon the provision in subsection (g)(6).

In the committee's view, the deletion of a requirement for performance guarantees on the initial production of a new weapon system is the most important change from section 794. It is a change which addresses many of the concerns about that provision and which should substantially increase the workability of the statutory warranty provision.

By permitting the Department to receive some initial production units of a new system before a performance guarantee is required, both the Department and the contractor should have a much more realistic understanding of the capabilities of the system. In addition, the costs of the system, and thus the price of a guarantee, should be much clearer after initial production. By delaying application of subsection (b)(1), contractor proposals for the price of a performance guarantee should be much more reasonable, since much of the risk of guaranteeing the very first units has been removed. Similarly, there should be no need for a downward negotiation of performance capabilities, since the fundamental performance characteristics of the new system should have been demonstrated in the initial production units. Furthermore, because much of the risk and uncertainty associated with the performance guarantee has been eliminated by this delayed application, claims by contractors for exclusive spare parts or maintenance provision can be more carefully scrutinized. Finally, to the extent that the potential risk for contractors is rationalized by this approach, the risk for subcontractors, including small businesses, will be more appropriate. The committee believes that this ability to exempt early production units from performance guarantees substantially enhances the workability of section 794 and should remove many of the adverse impacts discussed earlier of requiring full performance guarantees on initial production of new systems.

The question has been raised about calculating the total anticipated production of a system. Before a system goes into production, the Department has a program which anticipates a total procurement level. Obviously, this level may shift, in some cases increasing and in others decreasing. The committee believes that the provision can be most soundly implemented if the Department applies the 10-percent factor to the anticipated eventual total production at the time the first production contract is signed.

The committee is also aware that there is justifiable concern that the greatest risk in weapon system procurement is in the initial production of a new system. The committee has concluded that the adverse practical effect of requiring performance guarantees in initial production, as discussed earlier, outweighs the benefits. In the committee's view, the Department should rely on other management tools to insure the performance of new systems. Inspection, acceptance, and testing procedures should assure that the government receives equipment which meets military requirements. Moreover, the certainty that ambitious performance goals will be reached is largely a function of how the development phase has been managed and whether the transition from development to production is properly planned. In those cases where the Secretary believes that a contractual performance guarantee on initial production of a new system is desirable, the Secretary has the discretion to utilize such an approach. The Congress should not, however, insist on this approach in all situations.

The committee understands that in the normal sequence of procurement activities, it will be necessary to sign a contract or contracts covering production of a system beyond the initial 10 percent of the initial production quantity, before the first 10 percent or the initial production quantity of a system has been accepted. This situation obviously creates some difficulties in the administration of this provision, since the intent of the provision is to permit the government and the contractor to negotiate a performance guarantee once a meaningful number of initial units have been produced. The committee believes, however, that the Department has sufficient administrative discretion to devise methods that will permit it to obtain adequate operating experience with initial production units of new systems so as to achieve the purposes of this provision while at the same time applying the requirements of subsection (b)(1) to all units of production after the first 10 percent or the initial production quantity.

Finally, the committee expects to receive notification consistent with the provisions of subsection (e) whenever the Secretary of Defense elects not to obtain the full guarantees of subsection (b)(1).

Subsection (g) clarifies six unrelated issues regarding the implementation of the provision. First, the Secretary is explicitly given the authority in subsection (g)(1) to delegate his powers to administer this section, though the waiver authority delegation may not be below the level of an Assistant Secretary of Defense or an Assistant Secretary of a military department. The committee recognizes that many of the aspects of administering this provision are typically done at the contracting officer level, and it has no intention to adjust basic contract administration procedures. Waivers, however, should be subjected to top management review. The delegation of waiver authority has been limited for that reason.

Subsection (g)(2) clarifies that the Department may negotiate the specific details of a guarantee. The GAO found that the Department had similar authority under section 794 (GAO Report at 16-17.). The committee fully recognizes that the statutory provision is not a full contract guarantee clause, nor is it intended to be. It is intended as the basic outline of a policy. The committee understands that complete contractual guarantee clauses will have to include numerous other details, including various limitations and specifics on use, maintenance, coverage exclusions, duration, repair procedures, and acceptance testing. The committee would expect that contracting officers would continue to negotiate these details of the guarantee clause.

Subsection (g)(3) clarifies that the general exemption in subsection (c) for government furnished equipment is not intended to insulate a prime contractor from liability if such equipment should be installed improperly, or if the prime contractor should take other inappropriate actions with the effect of invalidating a warranty provided on the government furnished equipment to the United States. This statutory provision is consistent with the interpretation given by GAO to section 794 on this matter. (GAO Report at pp. 13-14.)

Subsection (g)(4) permits the Secretary of Defense to adjust a contract amount in lieu of accepting a cash payment for a remedy as provided in subsection (b)(3)(B). The committee is aware that in some cases contract performance may be completed before any claim under a warranty would be made. Obviously, in such circumstances the government would have to resort to accepting a payment from the contractor. In cases, however, where contract performance continues at the time that the breach of warranty is identified and the remedy utilized, the government could exercise its contractual rights through a reduction in future amounts owed to the contractor.

Subsection (g)(5) deals with situations in which the United States is utilizing dual source procurement strategy. Under such a strategy, after an initial source has begun production of a system or item of equipment, a second source is selected to produce the same system or equipment utilizing plans and specifications prepared by the first source in conjunction with the government. The committee was concerned that requiring performance guarantees from the second source, which had not been previously involved in the system design, would raise questions of equity. At the same time, it was determined that an exemption of a second source from performance guarantees throughout all production contracts awarded to the second source was not necessary. The committee determined that the second source qualified for an exemption similar to that provided for the first source. Thus, the Secretary may exempt up to one-tenth of the eventual total production anticipated for the second source from the requirements of subsection (b)(1).

Subsection (g)(6) states that the Secretary may use guarantees or warranties to a greater extent than required by the provision. Should the Secretary wish to apply guarantees or warranties to more systems or equipment than those covered by the provision, or to insist upon a more demanding guarantee, or to apply guarantees to stages of production for which guarantees are not required under this section, or to impose more comprehensive remedies than those specified in this section, he retains the discretion to do so.

Subsection (h) directs the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations for this provision.

SEC. 192, NEW REGULATIONS FOR ALLOCATING OVERHEAD TO PARTS TO WHICH THE PRIME CONTRACTOR HAS ADDED LITTLE VALUE

This section requires the Secretary of Defense to prescribe by regulation the manner in which the Department negotiates prices for supplies procured from a contractor which does not produce the supplies. The committee has become aware of some circumstances where the United States will place an order with a contractor, who then forwards an item provided by a subcontractor, while adding substantial costs to the price of the item as overhead expense. It is the committee's view that there should be some relationship between value added to product and the resulting price. For example, if the contractor inspects the product, that would reasonably give rise to some payment, as would product testing. The committee believes that the Secretary should be cognizant of the value added by the contractor in establishing this regulation.

SEC. 193, COST AND PRICING DATA

This section changes the threshold in law for the submission of certified cost and pricing data from $500,000 to $100,000. The Senate adopted this same change in S. 338, the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984, which was passed by the Senate in 1983, but has not yet passed the House of Representatives.

SEC. 194, ECONOMIC ORDER QUANTITIES

The Department of Defense has identified a failure of the military departments to order spare parts in economic order quantities as a major factor in the excessive prices sometimes paid for such parts. Accordingly, the committee has included a provision to require, where practicable, that supplies be procured in economic order quantities. Specifically, DOD would be required under the provision to include in each solicitation a clause requesting each contractor responding to the solicitation to state an opinion on whether the quantity of supplies proposed to be procured is economically advantageous to the United States, and, if applicable, to recommend two quantities which would be more economically advantageous to the United States.

SEC. 195, ADVOCATE FOR COMPETITION

This section requires that an Advocate for Competition be appointed by the Department of Defense. The specific responsibilities of the Advocate are set forth in the statute.

SEC. 196, PERSONNEL EVALUATIONS TO INCLUDE EMPHASIS ON COMPETITION AND COST SAVINGS

This section requires the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures to ensure that personnel appraisal systems of the Department of Defense give appropriate recognition to efforts to increase competition and achieve cost savings in contracting.

SEC. 197, PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTORS LIMITING SUBCONTRACTOR SALES DIRECTLY TO THE UNITED STATES

This section requires that each contract for the purchase of supplies or services by the Department of Defense shall provide that the contractor not enter into any agreement with a subcontractor that has the effect of restricting sales by the subcontractor directly to the United States. This section is not intended to prohibit a contractor from asserting rights protected by patent, licensing agreement, or any preexisting agreement involving the subcontractor's performance under a commercial contract.

SEC. 198, PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS

This section requires that regulations prescribed under this chapter by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department may not take effect until 30 days after such regulations have been published in the Federal Register for public comment.

SEC. 199, SPARE PARTS PROCUREMENT AND COMPETITION IMPROVEMENT

PLANNING FOR FUTURE COMPETITION

The committee recognizes the problems in attempting to competitively procure components within existing systems covered by existing contractual arrangements. Given these difficulties, the most effective way for procurement officials to ensure that components and parts are competitively procured at a cost most beneficial to the government is to begin planning for such procurement at the time of the initial solicitation for bids on competitive contracts and prior to actual negotiations on negotiated contracts. The committee therefore requires that the head of an agency take steps to ensure that certain indications of such planning, such as attempts to incorporate currently available components into the design of systems, contractual promises of intent to provide technical data on an unlimited basis, and other representations allowing the government buyer to make informed judgments regarding the competitive nature of subsequent purchases, be among the factors to be weighed by the contracting officer in determining contract award.

ENCOURAGING NEW COMPETITORS TO BROADEN THE INDUSTRIAL BASE

The committee concurs with the findings of the Senate Committee on Small Business regarding limiting the use of prequalification lists as a hindrance to competition and small business involvement. The requirements of the covered agencies in this portion of the act are clearly delineated in the statute.

TECHNICAL DATA TO BE SPECIFIED IN PROPOSALS

In addition to requiring that statements regarding intent to deliver technical data free from encumbrances be included as factors in deciding contract award, the committee believes it is equally important that the head of an agency issue regulations requiring all offers to include a statement on the extent of data and rights in data to be delivered to the United States with purchase. This information so furnished will then become one factor in deciding contract award.

The committee does not intend that only competitive contracts include provisions regarding technical data. Even if the original system is procured on a non-competitive basis, it is imperative that procurement personnel begin planning for competitive procurement of spare parts at the time of initial contract.

SPECIFICATION OF TECHNICAL DATA TO BE PURCHASED IN CONTRACTS

The committee has concluded that the most credible evidence of prior planning for the treatment of technical data will be evidenced by contractual provisions explicitly detailing the treatment of technical data, regardless of whether such data is purchased for the purpose of eventual competitive procurement or for some other reason. For this reason the statute requires that the contract specify the data to be purchased, establish criteria for acceptability of the data, establish a separate payment line for the data, and define the respective rights of the government and the contractor in the data.

The committee has also provided the authority to the government to withhold progress payments to contractors who have not complied with their contractual commitments regarding technical data.

Whenever a contractor or subcontractor asserts a limitation over any data, that party should be prepared to defend such assertion in writing to the contracting officer within 60 days. The committee does however recognize that there may be occasions when the contractor was not able to properly identify an item as proprietary at the time of contract. When such omission was inadvertent the committee does provide for later protection of such claim by the Department.

This section also includes provisions to require the development and implementation of systems to better manage technical data in the covered agencies.

VALIDATING PROPRIETARY DATA RESTRICTIONS

This section establishes the process by which the contractor and the government may reach an agreement regarding proprietary data restrictions that have been challenged. In particular when the government challenges a proprietary restriction that is found to be not substantially justified, then the government's cost of such challenge shall be reimbursed by the contractor. The committee does not intend that in every case where a challenge is successful the government's cost should be reimbursed. The language is provided as a deterrent against parties who would force the Government to formally challenge designations that are substantially without merit.

SEC. 199A, COMPUTER MANAGEMENT OF SPARE PARTS

This section would require that the Department submit to the Congress within 180 days a plan for upgrading its computer capability so as to increase its management tools to deal with spare parts issues.

SEC. 199B, PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

This section provides for cooperative agreements to be made between the Department of Defense and state and local governments and nonprofit organizations that provide technical assistance to firms that seek to bid for defense procurements. Such existing technical assistance centers have increased competition for defense contracts and subcontracts, including spare parts, and to ensure the capability of businesses to perform defense contracts. Under this section, the Department of Defense will enter into cost-sharing, cooperative agreements with existing procurement technical assistance centers and with new centers that will be formed as a result of these agreements. These agreements will be entered into on a competitive basis, in which state and local governments and other recipients will submit applications to the Secretary of Defense. Such applications will include a description of the geographic area to be served, assurances that the applicant will furnish a matching amount of funds to carry out the agreement, assurances that the applicant will not pay more than 10 percent of the monies for private consultant services, and such other information as the Secretary may require. In the case of existing centers, applicants will be required to submit additional information relating to program experience.

To insure that the benefits of this program are nationwide in scope, there should be no less than one such cooperative agreement in each Defense contract administration services region. Additionally, each procurement center should be located sufficiently close to an appropriate Defense contract administration services region office to receive necessary staff training and other appropriate assistance.

SEC. 199C, REVISIONS OF REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTION ACQUISITION REPORTS AND UNIT COST REPORTS

This section would amend sections 139a and 139b of title 10 of the United States Code. Section 139a deals with the Selected Acquisition Report (SAR) system and section 139b deals with the Unit Cost Report system.

The amendments to existing law, most of which are technical in nature, would make the following changes:

1. establishes a minimum dollar threshold of $2,000,000 on major contracts for which SAR reporting is required;
2. requires quarterly SARs only when there is a 5 percent or greater change in total program cost, or when there is a 3 month or greater delay in any of the baseline SAR milestones;

3. extends annual SAR submission date to 60 days after submission of the President's budget and provides that quarterly SARs are to be submitted 45 days after the end of the fiscal year quarter;

4. requires that Preliminary Reports be submitted within 30 days of the date on which the President submits the Budget to Congress;

5. provides for automatic termination of SAR reporting when 90 percent of planned deliveries or 90 percent of planned expenditures have been made;

6. deletes the requirement to submit multiple unit cost reports when successive baselines have been breached;

7. permits unit cost report for the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year to coincide with the President's budget submission to Congress;

8. limits termination of obligations to research and development, procurement, and military construction funding when failure to meet reporting requirements; and

9. places a severability clause in the statute.

SEC. 199D, TENURE OF KEY PROCUREMENT MANAGERS IN THE MILITARY SERVICES

There is a general consensus that one of the major problems in the Department of Defense acquisition process is program instability. There are many causes of this instability, including instability of Defense budget levels and meddling in procurement decisions by all layers of the Defense Department bureaucracy and the Congress. The relatively short tenure of key procurement managers in the military services is both a cause and a manifestation of the overall instability in the Defense Department weapons acquisition process.

This year the committee received testimony concerning the average tenure of program managers for the current Selected Acquisition Report (SAR) systems in each of the military services. According to this testimony, the average tenure of program managers for the Army's current SAR programs is 2.2 years; for the Air Force's current SAR programs, 2.3 years; and for the Navy's current SAR programs, 3.0 years.

This same instability exists at the top of the major procurement commands in each of the military services. For the last 15 years, the average tour of duty for the commanding officer of the Army Material Development and Readiness Command has been 3 years; for the Naval Material Command, just under 3 years; for the Air Force Systems Command, 2 years; and for the Air Force Logistics Command, 2½ years. The Air Force Systems Command has not had a commanding officer stay for more than 3 years since 1970.

In the committee's recent hearings on the organization and management of the Department of Defense, witnesses such as former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and former Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard recommended longer tenure and greater accountability for program managers. The recent Report of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, also known as the Grace Commission, made similar recommendations. One of their recommendations to improve program stability is to "lengthen the assignment period of key Government personnel, such as program managers." The Grace Commission also concluded:

> "We have determined from private sector sources that industry keeps key employees in positions on an average of 8 years for projects and operations of less financial magnitude and technical complexity than major defense weapons systems."

The committee has reviewed current policies concerning program manager tenure in the Department of Defense. DOD Directive 5000.1, "Major System Acquisitions", directs each of the Service Secretaries to "ensure that the program manager's tenure is of sufficient length to provide continuity and management stability."

Recent Army policy on this subject states that program managers "are considered to have accepted a moral obligation to fulfill at least a 3-year assignment for the project for which designated." The Air Force does not have any specific written policy concerning program manager tour lengths, but Air Force officials have indicated that the Air Force tries to make the rotation date for their program managers coincide with major program milestones. The Navy has recently adopted a policy of 4-year tour lengths for their program managers, with rotation dates to coincide with major program milestones whenever possible. The committee believes the Navy's example should be followed by the other services.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision, which establishes a statutory tour of 4 years, or completion of a major program milestone, for program managers of SAR systems; establishes a statutory tour of 4 years for commanders of each of the Military Services' major procurement commands; and gives the Service Secretary the authority to waive these tour lengths in unusual or unforeseen circumstances.

The committee believes that this provision will improve stability and accountability in the Defense Department weapons acquisition process by leaving key procurement managers in place longer. The committee's provision provides a waiver authority for the tour lengths prescribed by this provision for unusual or unforeseen circumstances. However, the committee has placed this waiver authority at a high enough level (Service Secretary) so that its use should be the exception rather than the rule. It is the committee's intent that as this provision is implemented, military promotion boards should give full consideration to the tour lengths prescribed by this provision and the significant responsibilities of program managers of major SAR systems when these individuals are under consideration for promotion. The committee will also take into account the prior program management experience of flag and general officers nominated for positions at the military procurement commands before acting upon such nominations.

SEC. 199E, SHIPBUILDING CLAIMS

The committee has been apprised of two concerns with respect to section 787 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of fiscal year 1984, Public Law 98-212.

First, a concern has been expressed about the appropriate meaning of the word "events," and when the 18-month period for filing shipbuilding claims would begin. The committee believes that the Department of the Navy has adequate discretion to set forth procedures in its regulations that will result in a fair implementation of this provision. Concern has been expressed, for example, that if government furnished equipment was received by a contractor and if defects in that equipment were not discovered for some period of time, the 18-month time period would start to run when the equipment was received, not when the defect was recognized. It would seem to the committee, however, that in virtually all such cases, the reasonable and appropriate interpretation would be that the event triggering the 18-month period occurs when the defect in the equipment is discovered and the government directs its removal and repair or replacement. This is an event which contractor management should have no difficulty in recognizing. This is not to say that contractors are relieved from any receiving inspection obligation required by the Navy. But the general expectation is that the 18-month period should begin to run when a contractor either knew or should have known of a particular event.

The committee considered amending the statute with respect to the word "events," but elected at this time not to do so, since the committee understands that the Department of the Navy intends to implement the statute consistent with the general guidance provided here. If the committee should learn at a later time that the statute is being implemented in such a way as to treat shipbuilders in an inequitable fashion, the committee would look more closely at actual amendment of the statute.

A second issue was raised with respect to a requirement at the end of section 787 that "the shipbuilding claim, request, or demand is fully documented and substantiated in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of Defense." The concern was expressed that this phrase could be read to amend the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, Public Law 95–563. That law already requires that claims of more than $50,000 be accompanied by a contractor certification that the claim is made in good faith, that the supporting data are accurate and complete to the best knowledge and belief of the contractor, and that the amount requested accurately reflects the contract adjustment for which the contractor believes that the government is liable. (See section 6(c)(1) of Public Law 95–563.) In the committee's view, this provision of law is a requirement for certification and documentation. There is no need to change this provision, only to require the submission of the supporting data with the claim, which the committee amendment does. The committee expects that regulations issued by the Secretary of the Navy will define what constitutes acceptable and satisfactory documentation for claims. Such documentation should be adequate to commence a full and comprehensive analysis of the claim with as much specificity as the facts will permit and not consist only of opinions, conclusions, or judgmental assertions. The committee believes that a requirement for submission of supporting documentation is necessary for the government to be in a position to resolve claims expeditiously and fairly, and therefore such a requirement has been incorporated. To date, the committee is not aware of any evidence that 18 months is not a sufficient time for contractors to assess the consequences of an event, assemble all pertinent documentation to support their claimed amount, and submit this documentation with their claim properly certified as provided in the Contract Disputes Act of 1978.

SEC. 199F, SPARE PARTS PRICE INCREASE JUSTIFICATION

During consideration of the fiscal year 1984 DOD Authorization Bill the Senate adopted an amendment requiring that in the event of a spare parts price increase in excess of a percentage to be established by the Secretary of Defense in 1 year, the contracting officer must file a written justification with the head of the procuring activity. Since implementation of this procedure, the committee has determined that this procedure is unnecessary when the purchase was made competitively. Therefore, the committee proposes to permit the Secretary to limit application of this procedure to spare parts bought on a non-competitive basis.

SEC. 199G, INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATES

Section 1203(a) of the 1984 Department of Defense Authorization Act added a new provision to title 10, codified as 10 U.S.C. 139c, prohibiting the Secretary of Defense from approving full scale engineering development or the production and deployment of a major defense program, unless an independent estimate of the cost of the program has been submitted to, and considered by, the Secretary.

This provision was added because the committee believed that the Department's program of independent cost estimates was a valuable management tool and should be expanded to require an independent cost estimate by the Office of the Secretary of Defense prior to approving full scale engineering development.

Last year's Authorization Act also required, in section 1203(c), that the Secretary report to the Committees on Armed Services in the Senate and House of Representatives on the use of independent cost estimates in the Department, and on whether adequate financial and personnel resources had been allocated to this program. Secretary Weinberger submitted that report on May 1, 1984. The committee has reviewed the report carefully and finds it extremely useful. It details the great utility of independent cost estimates in developing an acquisition strategy and assessing true costs and states that because such estimates play a crucial role, more resources are being assigned to the program. The Secretary and his staff are to be commended for this excellent report.

The committee believes that a follow-on report would be useful in continuing to monitor the role of independent cost estimating in the acquisition process. Therefore the committee directs the department to prepare a report substantially similar to last year's report, but with particular emphasis as to the allocation of adequate resources to those organizations or offices charged with developing or assessing independent cost estimates.

TITLE I, PART I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The bill includes 18 General Provisions in Title I, Part I. Those provisions which have not been previously discussed are explained in detail below. A number of General Provisions have been considered in other parts of the report, and discussions of these provisions can be found as follows:

Section number	Subject	Report discussion
1002	DOD schools	Title I, Part E.
1003	NATO Seasparrow	Weapons procurement, Navy.
1004	Exemption from induction authority	Title I, Part E.
1005	Marine Corps insignia	Title I, Part E.
1006	Industrial funding of nuclear weapons	Title III, Section 331.
1008	Foreign ship construction	Other procurement, Army.
1010	MX missile program	Missile procurement, Air Force.
1011	B–1	Aircraft procurement, Air Force.
1012	FFG–7 frigates	RDT&E, Navy.
1013	ASAT	RDT&E, Air Force.
1018	Coast Guard/Reserve Forces Policy Board	Title I, Part E.

SEC. 1001, REPORT ON ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMON DEFENSE

The Defense Authorization Acts for the 4 preceding fiscal years have required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress a Report on Allied Contributions to the Common Defense. The reports have discussed the economic and social factors that influence the Western allies' defense postures; the shortfalls that exist in meeting defense responsibilities; U.S. efforts to encourage our allies to fulfill their defense commitments; and plans to protect Western interests in the security of Southwest Asia.

The committee's interest in this burdensharing report reflects its deep concern over the failure of our allies, especially Japan, to fulfill the defense commitments that they have undertaken in formal agreements and unilateral policy declarations. The real growth in defense spending achieved by most NATO members remains well below the 3-percent goal agreed upon by all NATO nations in 1978. In particular, the 1984 edition of the burdensharing report documents that the weighted average annual real increases of our NATO allies has declined each year since at least 1980, and that this measure for 1984 is again tentatively projected to be the lowest since that date. The committee finds this especially disappointing.

Of even more concern, however, is the slow progress of our allies in producing actual improvements to their military capabilities. For example, Japan has advanced very little in implementing its pledge to defend the air and sea lines of communication out to 1,000 miles from its coast. The recent decision by Japan to delay even further the completion date of a now-outdated defense improvement program is distressing.

The annual reports prepared by the Secretary of Defense have been very helpful in enhancing congressional understanding of defense burdensharing, as well as focusing public attention on the disparities between United States and allied efforts. Because this issue is likely to remain important and controversial for some time, the committee recommends that the requirement for the burden-sharing report be made permanent in a free-standing provision of law.

SEC. 1007, PROCUREMENT IN LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

This amendment continues for one more year a test program that allows a limited price differential to be paid for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations on any contract entered into by the Defense Logistics Agency, except a contract for the purchase of fuel. The committee has been disappointed with the manner in which the Department has administered this program. The most recent report submitted to the Congress on implementation of the set-aside program reveals that only $3.1 billion worth of contracts have been awarded through fiscal year 1983. This record of performance despite inclusion of $14.8 billion for this program in the last four subsequent Department of Defense Authorization Acts indicates a serious lack of intent to comply with congressional direction. The committee urges that the annual spending targets of this program be met, as they have not been met since the program's inception. In addition, the committee urges that the program be evaluated based on the following criteria: increased competition for all contracts under this program; the number of contracts awarded to firms in labor surplus areas under the program; job creation results in labor surplus areas as a result of the program; additional contract costs as a result of the program; and economic dislocation in non-labor surplus areas as a result of the program.

The committee requests that all subsequent reports be delivered in a timely fashion.

SEC. 1009, PROCUREMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Reciprocal procurement and exchange of communications support or related supplies and services between the United States and its allies within the NATO geographic region have proven to be of significant mutual benefit, particularly in the realm of satellite communications. The overseas communications needs of the Department of Defense can be more easily and economically met while at the same time facilitating cooperation within NATO and enhancing communications interoperability and standardization due to the desire on the part of the allies to use either their own, NATO or U.S. satellite assets in the event of overloading and emergency.

However, several allies are now placing communications satellites into orbit outside of the NATO geographic area. The North Atlantic, Indian Ocean, and Pacific regions are of particular interest. In these regions the ability of the United States to enter into reciprocal arrangements is not specifically authorized and is thus limited. The benefits that have accrued to the United States in NATO, could also be realized in these regions if there were specific authorization to enter into reciprocal arrangements with United States allies in these regions. For example, it would be highly advantageous for the United States to be able to use a British satellite in the Indian Ocean in the event of a failure of a U.S. satellite, or in the event of an emergency buildup of forces in the area.

In fiscal year 1984, the administration requested an amendment to Title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into necessary reciprocal communication support agreements with the governments of allied countries and NATO subsidiary bodies for areas outside NATO's regional boundaries. Although the committee recommended approval of this proposal, the Congress only provided the necessary authority for fiscal year 1984. However, there is a continuing need for this authority beyond fiscal year 1984 as the United States finds its requirements expanding.

Thus, the administration has requested an amendment to chapter 141 of title 10, U.S. Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to enter into an arrangement with the Minister of Defense or other appropriate official of any allied country or with NATO, whereby in return for providing to the United States communications support and related supplies and services the United States agrees to provide to such country or NATO an equivalent value of communications support and related supplies and services. The provision defines "allied country" to mean all NATO countries, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, or Korea.

The committee expects that any such arrangement entered into under the authority of this provision will be reduced to writing. In addition, the committee added a requirement that the Secretary of Defense shall submit any documents evidencing such an arrangement to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 45 days after entering into such an arrangement.

The committee continues to believe that the extension of reciprocal communications support arrangements would be a cost-effective cooperative program with our allies.

The committee, therefore, recommends approval of the administration's legislative proposal on reciprocal communications support.

SEC. 1014, NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

In 1976 the Congress authorized production of Naval Petroleum Reserves 1, 2 and 3 located at Elk Hills, California, Buena Vista, California, and Teapot Dome, Wyoming respectively. The expressed intent of this congressional authorization was to meet national defense requirements.

Under provisions of the 1976 Act, receipts from sales of petroleum products from the Reserves were to be deposited into a Naval Petroleum Reserves special account. Funds in this account were to be made available to pay the expenses of operating, exploring and developing the Reserves. Funds in this account would also be made available for construction and operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In 1977, the law was amended and the receipts were covered into the Treasury.

The committee finds that present production does not meet national defense needs. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision to require deposit of 30 percent of the receipts, in excess of those necessary for production, operation, exploration and maintenance of the Reserves, in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund. These funds are to remain in the Transaction Fund until expended. The committee makes this recommendation out of concern for the status of the National Defense Stockpile. The current administration is the first in 20 years to request authority for purchases for the stockpile. Such purchases however, are funded through sales of materials no longer needed in the stockpile.

The committee's decision on 30 percent of the Naval Petroleum Reserves receipts in excess of operating expenses is neither arbitrary nor permanent; purchases for the stockpile during fiscal year 1985 using the anticipated revenues from sales of excess materials under current disposal authority, plus the revenues from the Naval Petroleum reserves receipts designated for deposit in the Stockpile Transaction Fund during fiscal year 1985 by this section, are consistent with the level of purchases presently authorized for the National Defense Stockpile.

The funds requested in the bill are those necessary for production, operation, conservation, development and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum Reserves during fiscal year 1985. The committee recommends full authorization of the amount requested. Revenues generated from sales from the Naval Petroleum Reserves will fund this program.

SEC. 1015, NUCLEAR WINTER

This section requires a report from the Secretary of Defense on the climatological, environmental, and other effects of nuclear war along with their policy implications.

SEC. 1016, POLYGRAPHS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Following the expressed intentions of the Department of Defense to increase the use of the polygraph as an investigative and screening tool, the Congress last year imposed a moratorium on implementation of such increased use until hearings were to be held on the effectiveness of the device. Senator Jackson was a moving force behind this effort on the Senate side, having expressed concern about the technique's reliability and the appropriateness of the suggested new uses.

Meetings between DOD personnel and the staffs of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the Armed Services Committee have reduced the gap between the proposed new rules and the levels of use acceptable to some members. Nevertheless, there are still some concerns and differences of opinion.

It is to be noted that within the polygraph community, there is wide disagreement as to the reliability, validity, and utility of the polygraph technique. The Office of Technology Assessment has reported that there is no satisfactory data validating the polygraph in a screening mode. The Defense Department has responded that experience in the National Security Agency has demonstrated utility, in that security risks were successfully screened by the use of the polygraph and associated interviews. It also asserts that the false positive rate, of concern to critics in OTA and elsewhere, can be reduced to a negligible level by re-examination and further investigation. It has produced extensive background information in support of this assertion.

The committee realizes that a balance must be struck between the rights of the individual and the exigencies of national security. A significant false positive rate could have a deleterious effect on the morale of Department personnel, and could be unfair to many employees, if the polygraph system were substantially expanded. In order to deal with the conflicting needs in this area, the committee recommends that a test program, along the lines of the recently proposed draft directive of the Department, be implemented. The results of this implementation should be closely monitored by the cognizant congressional committees.

In addition, in view of the sudden great increase in the need for training polygraph examiners which shall be occasioned by the new policy of increased polygraph use, the committee requests the General Accounting Office to make a study of the effectiveness of the current Department training program for such personnel, in order to make such recommendations for upgrade as may be appropriate.

SEC. 1017, CIVIL AIR PATROL (CAP)

The committee has proposed statutory language that would increase the authority of the Secretary of the Air Force to provide and procure equipment for the Civil Air Patrol (CAP). The CAP was chartered by Congress in 1946 to provide emergency search and rescue services and to provide aeronautical education for its members and the public. The CAP currently consists of approximately 68,000 volunteer members of which approximately 11,000 participate in Air Force authorized search and rescue missions. The CAP operates about 5,600 aircraft of which approximately 5,000 are privately owned.

The committee's proposal would amend section 9441 of Title 10 United States Code relating to support of the Civil Air Patrol by the Air Force. The Amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to pay, out of funds otherwise appropriated for the Air Force, the expenses of placing major items of equipment furnished to the CAP by the Air Force into serviceable condition and to purchase major items of equipment for the CAP that the Secretary may consider needed to carry out CAP missions. Additionally, the Secretary would be authorized to furnish Air Force uniform articles to CAP cadets without cost to the cadets. The amendment to section 9441 is intended to be enabling legislation only and does not authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the Air Force for support of the CAP. The amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to arrange for the use by the CAP of facilities and services under the jurisdiction of the Army, Navy and other departments and agencies of the U.S. government under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force and approved by the Secretary of Defense. The use of Army, Navy, or other federal facilities or services by the CAP will be subject to existing law and to the agreement of the heads of the other departments or agencies furnishing facilities or services. The effective date of the amendment would be October 1, 1984.

The authority of the Secretary of the Air Force to provide equipment and make available facilities to the CAP shall be limited to those necessary to perform CAP missions. Authority for use of government facilities shall not include the use of such facilities as base exchanges, commissaries, clubs, or athletic facilities.

The proposed provision would amend the "CAP Supply Bill" originally enacted in 1945, now codified in Title 10 United States Code. That statute designated the CAP as an official auxiliary of the Air Force and authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to furnish the CAP certain logistics and personnel support. In return for this support, the Secretary was authorized to use the CAP in performing certain noncombat missions for the Air Force. The proposed provision is an extension of that legislation.

TITLE I, PART J—CODIFICATION OF CERTAIN RECURRING AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW

Section 1101(a) would codify, as section 520b of title 10, that portion of section 709 of the DOD Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the issuance of authorized items to applicants for enlistment, and make a conforming amendment.

Section 1101(b) would codify, as section 956 of title 10, those portions of sections 706 and 709 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the purposes for which DOD funds may be used in conjunction with the handling and processing of deserters, prisoners, absentees, prisoners of war, and other persons in custody of the armed forces, and make a conforming amendment.

Section 1101(c)(1) would codify, as section 979 of title 10, section 732 of the DOD Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the prohibition on granting or guaranteeing to loans to persons convicted by general court-martial of certain crimes tending to prevent officials or students of institutions of higher learning from performing duties or pursuing an education.

That section also would codify, as section 980 of title 10, section 734 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to limitations on the use of humans as experimental subjects.

That section also would codify, as section 981 of title 10, section 820 of Public Law 94-106 and section 742 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984, relating to the number of enlisted members who may be assigned or detached as enlisted aides.

That section also would codify, as section 982 of title 10, section 745 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the prohibition on payment of lodging expenses when adequate government quarters are available.

Section 1101(c)(2) would make conforming amendments to title 10 required by the codification of provisions by section 1101(c)(1).

Section 1101(d)(1) would codify, as section 1044 of title 10, section 727 of the DOD Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984, relating to an allowance for civilian clothing for certain enlisted members.

That section also would codify, as section 1045 of title 10, section 709(a) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984, relating to the payment of a gratuity to persons discharged for fraudulent enlistment.

That section also would codify, as section 1046 of title 10, sections 709(c) and 709(d) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the provision of subsistence to various categories of personnel.

That section also would codify, as section 1047 of title 10, section 709(i) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the payment of certain expenses of officers and students of Latin American countries which are necessary for Latin American cooperation.

Section 1101(d)(2) would make conforming amendments required by codification of provisions by section 1101(d)(1).

Section 1101(d)(3) would repeal section 7208 of title 10, and make conforming changes, which is no longer necessary in light of the codification of section 709(i) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984, as accomplished by section 1101(d)(1) of the bill.

Section 1101(e)(1) would codify, as section 1074(c) of title 10, section 735 of the DOD Appropriation Act of fiscal year 1984 relating to the provision of medical and dental care to certain persons.

Section 1101(e)(2) would codify, as section 1074b of title 10, section 739 of the DOD Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the authority to and limitations upon the provision of wigs to individuals entitled to military medical care, and would make a conforming amendment.

Section 1101(e)(3) would codify, as section 1077(b)(3) of title 10, section 752 of the DOD Appropriation Act relating to prohibition of providing elective correction of minor dermatological blemishes and marks and minor anatomical anomalies.

Section 1101(e)(4)(A) would codify, as clauses (8)–(15) of section 1079(a) of title 10, sections 737, 738(a), 738(b), 738(c), 738(d), 738(e), and 738(g) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to certain limitations upon the types of case which may be provided under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS), and would make required technical amendments.

Section 1101(e)(4)(B) would codify, in section 1079(h)(2) of title 10, section 785 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the adjustment of the base period used to evaluate billing charges under CHAMPUS.

Section 1101(e)(5) would codify, as section 1093 of title 10, section 751 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the limitation on use of funds for the performance of abortions and would make conforming amendments.

Section 1101(f)(1) would codify, as section 2006 of title 10, section 720 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to limitations on the payment for tuition for off-duty training and education.

That section also would codify, as section 2007 of title 10, section 709(k) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the use of funds for certain impact aid purposes.

That section also would codify, as section 2008 of title 10, section 809 of the DOD Authorization Act for fiscal year 1979 relating to conditions under which a college or university may continue to be designated a military college.

Section 1101(f)(2) would make conforming changes required by the amendments made by section 1101(f)(1).

Section 1101(g) would codify, as section 2104(b)(6) of title 10, section 721 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the execution of a loyalty oath by those enrolled in advance training of the senior division of the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Section 1101(h) would codify, as section 2483 of title 10, section 713 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the operations of commissary stores, and make a conforming amendment.

Section 1101(c) would codify, as section 2637 of title 10, section 708(i) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the transportation of civilian clothing of new enlisted members of the armed forces. The section also would codify, as section 2638 of title 10, section 708(a) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the provision of transportation of minor dependents to and from schools. The section also would make conforming amendments required by the codification of sections 2637 and 2638 of title 10.

Section 1102(a) would codify, in section 206(e) of title 37, section 722 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the payment for National Guard or reserve component training conducted during other than a regular period of instruction or duty.

Section 1102(b) would codify, as section 306a of title 37, section 708(b) of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the payment of personnel under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 while those personnel are assigned to international headquarters, and make conforming amendments.

Section 1102(c) would codify, in section 404(g) of title 37, that portion of section 761 of the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1984 relating to the payment of basic allowance for subsistence when a member is furnished government meals while in travel status.

Section 1103 would codify, in subclause (iv) of clause (a) of section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)(A)(iv)), section 819 of the DOD Appropriation Act (Public Law 95-845) relating to the status of commissary baggers and carryout persons.

Section 1104 would repeal certain sections of law made unnecessary by the above codification provisions.

TITLE II—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Purpose of Title II

The purpose of title II is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1985. The administration's request is reflected in S. 2364 as introduced by request. This title, as approved by the Committee on Armed Services, totals $9,297,689,000 in authorization for appropriation and provides construction in support of the Military Services, Guard and Reserve components, Defense Agencies, NATO Infrastructure, and includes military family housing requirements. Committee review resulted in a net reduction of $1,202,113,000 from the total $10,499,802,000 initially requested in new authorization for appropriation for fiscal year 1985.

A brief summary of the authorizations provided in this title follows:

Authorization for Appropriations Granted, Fiscal Year 1985

Part A (Army):	
Inside the United States [1]	$1,409,070,000
Outside the United States	424,050,000
Unspecified minor construction	33,000,000
Planning and design	160,000,000
Family housing construction	88,858,000
Family housing support	1,246,754,000
Subtotal	3,361,732,000
Part B (Navy):	
Inside the United States	1,161,555,000
Outside the United States	197,070,000
Unspecified minor construction	19,000,000
Planning and design	140,900,000
Defense access roads	4,000,000
Santa Margarita water project	142,000,000
Family housing construction	114,070,000
Family housing support	572,986,000
Subtotal	2,351,581,000
Part C (Air Force):	
Inside the United States	1,168,166,000
Outside the United States	393,142,000
Unspecified minor construction	21,000,000
Planning and design	143,900,000
Defense access roads	21,750,000
Family housing construction	196,241,000
Family housing support	742,332,000
Subtotal	2,686,531,000
Part D (Defense agencies):	
Inside the United States	158,203,000
Outside the United States	141,242,000

Unspecified minor construction	4,000,000
Contingency construction	5,000,000
Planning and design	30,000,000
Family housing construction	800,000
Family housing support	19,000,000
Subtotal	358,245,000
Part E (NATO infrastructure)	131,700,000
Part F (Guard and Reserve Forces):	
Army National Guard	97,000,000
Army Reserve	70,400,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	62,000,000
Air National Guard	110,700,000
Air Force Reserve	67,800,000
Subtotal	407,900,000
Total authorization of appropriations	9,297,689,000

BACKGROUND

Military construction requirements for fiscal year 1985 identified in this legislation were developed on the same basis as the Department of Defense request presented to Congress for military procurement. This concept involves the so-called package-program method of identifying our military forces with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons, equipment, and facilities necessary to discharge effectively these assigned mission responsibilities.

The Department of Defense initially requested authorization in the amount of $10,499,802,000 for fiscal year 1985 which was approximately 23 percent higher than the $8,547,586,000 requested for fiscal year 1984 by the administration and 43 percent higher than the $7,345,527,000 authorized for appropriations for fiscal year 1984. One quarter of the initial fiscal year 1985 request was for operation and maintenance of military housing and the rest, $7.8 billion, was for new construction. Construction in the United States accounted for 73 percent, with 18 percent for bases in Europe, and 9 percent in other areas overseas. In addition, the Department submitted a supplemental bill for construction of a fueling pier at Keflavik, Iceland. The $30 million requested for this project will be the U.S share of this jointly-funded project with NATO. On May 3, 1984, the Department of Defense announced reduction of the fiscal year 1985 budget request, including the Military Construction and Family Housing programs by $1.25 billion in new budget authority in response to the President's announcement on March 15, 1984 to seek bipartisan agreement to reduce Federal deficits by $150 billion over the next 3 years.

The committee carefully assessed each proposal and project to assure that only those items which are essential to our national defense interests would be approved.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The fiscal year 1985 military construction authorization bill was introduced as S. 2364. Hearings on this bill were conducted by the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on

Armed Services. The subcommittee met on five separate occasions and reviewed in depth the projects contained in the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense requests. These requests to the Congress covered nearly 1,500 individual projects at approximately 700 military installations within the United States and overseas. After extensive hearings the committee reduced the requests by $1,202,113,000.

The following table indicates the changes made to the various parts of the title.

CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1985 request	Changes by committee	Total amount approved by committee
Part A—Army	$3,687,174	−$325,442	$3,361,732
Part B—Navy	2,509,086	−157,505	2,351,581
Part C—Air Force	3,136,742	−450,211	2,686,531
Part D—Defense agencies	479,300	−121,055	358,245
Part E—NATO infrastructure	296,700	−165,000	131,700
Part F—Guard and Reserve	390,800	+17,100	407,900
Total	10,499,802	−1,202,113	9,297,689

AREAS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS

HOSPITAL SIZING

The committee has, in general, been supportive of the construction requests for replacement military hospitals. Proper medical care is a benefit to which every service member and his family are entitled and the ability to deliver health care in time of mobilization is a critical aspect of national security.

However, the committee is concerned that the military departments may not be taking advantage of excess civilian medical care capacity available in many major metropolitan areas. It may well be that it would be more cost effective to use civilian health care facilities as provided for under the CHAMPUS program rather than constructing and operating new military health care facilities. The committee recognizes that the military departments conduct economic analyses, which take into consideration the health care capability of the surrounding civilian communities. These analyses serve as the basis for sizing of military hospitals and the sizing criteria have been the subject of much scrutiny in the past.

The committee believes that it is time for a fresh, independent look at this issue. Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense convene a "Blue Ribbon Panel" of health care experts from outside the Defense Department to review the criteria for sizing military hospitals and to determine if expanded use of available civilian health care facilities could be cost effective. The committee believes that such an effort could be completed with dispatch so that the Panel's finding could influence the size of Madigan Army Hospital and Travis Air Force Base Hospital which are authorized in this bill. The committee directs that the Panel's findings be made available by March 1, 1985. In addition the committee added bill language directing that no size specific construction effort be undertaken until the results of the Panel are made available.

WORLD WAR II BUILDINGS

The committee has placed emphasis on getting rid of World War II temporary wooden buildings for several years. In a report provided by committee direction, it appears that the Navy and Air Force are aggressively pursuing this effort. The Army, however, with over 100 million square feet of such facilities in its inventory, plans to dispose of only 38 million square feet by 1990. The committee recognizes that it may be prudent to keep some small numbers of these facilities for mobilization purposes, but the Army should be able to get rid of 60–70 percent of its current inventory by 1990 with an aggressive effort. In order to expedite this process, the committee has added section 282 which requires the Army to demolish one square foot of World War II facility for every square foot of new facility that is added to the inventory. The committee believes that this approach is reasonable. The committee does not intend that demolition must occur on the same installation where new construction is added to the inventory, but every time a new facility is added to the inventory a corresponding demolition must occur somewhere in the Army. This effort involves U.S. installations only.

CHILD CARE CENTERS

Child care has become a critical necessity at most military installations. Quality child care is an important career incentive for working spouses and single parents. The military has underway a significant program to build new child care centers; for fiscal year 1985 the request was for 19 child care centers at about $30 million.

The committee believes, based upon testimony received, that there is potential for cost savings if child care construction and operation could be contracted to private enterprise. There are firms in the United States today who specialize in the delivery of child care and these firms have expressed an interest in competing for military work.

The committee has authorized the child care facilities requested. However, before any contracts are awarded for these facilities, the committee directs that each of the Services seek to enter into a third party contract via the competitive bidding process with a private firm to build and operate one child care facility on a U.S. base. A report of this effort, to include the cost analysis upon which a decision is based, must be furnished to the appropriate committees of Congress 15 days before any action is taken to award any contract for a child care center under conventional procedures.

The committee emphasizes that the child care costs of concern are the total cost to the Government under the third party option versus the conventional procedure. The child care fee structure is a separate issue. The military subsidizes child care under conventional procedures currently being utilized; the committee expects that the military may continue to subsidize child care under the third party contracting option.

NATO BURDEN-SHARING

The committee remains concerned with the NATO burden-sharing issue. Construction for U.S. forces deployed in NATO continues to cost more than $1 billion annually. While the Congress has supported this level of expenditures in the past, concern is growing that our allies are not participating equitably.

The committee has denied the Army's request for facilities for ammunition storage. The committee has three concerns in that regard. First is the issue of burden-sharing—why shouldn't these facilities be built under the NATO Infrastructure program? Second, the committee is concerned that the United States continues to build and store ammunition in quantities far in excess of the levels stored by our allies. It makes little sense for the United States to store 60 days worth of ammunition if our allies have only a 7-day supply. Finally, the committee has been advised that the Army is considering storing ammunition directly in flexible membrane rather than building igloos. This has the potential to save costs and to permit rapid handling. The committee will not authorize further ammunition storage facilities until these concerns are adequately addressed.

SECTION 6 SCHOOLS

At some 18 military installations the military owns and operates the dependent schools, independent from local school districts. In general, these independent military schools, referred to as Section 6 schools, were established in the 1950's because local schools were segregated. Until 1980, the costs to operate and maintain these schools were paid by the Department of Education. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 transferred funding responsibility for these schools to the Defense Department. The committee believes that these schools should be transferred to the jurisdiction of the local school districts.

The fiscal year 1985 construction request contains $53 million for construction, renovation or addition to these schools. Another $50 million is expected to be requested next year. The committee has authorized the requested funds but they may not be obligated until the local school districts agree to take over jurisdiction of the schools. (See section 283.)

THIRD PARTY CONTRACTING

Last year, the committee recommended that the services consider financing the construction and operation of new heating plants and major modification to existing heating plants at its bases through third-party contracting. Should third-party contracting prove cost-effective and feasible, it could obviate the need to spend millions of taxpayer dollars for these facilities.

Presently, the Air Force is in the process of considering third-party contracting for at least two heating plants—at Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., and at K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Mich.

The committee has been made aware that the services are considering several additional heating plant projects for inclusion in their fiscal 1986 and out-year military construction program. For example, the committee is aware of a project at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., which has slipped several years in the past.

The committee strongly urges the services to pursue third-party contracting for these projects as soon as possible, to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the third-party approach. Undertaking this evaluation now will enable the services to provide the committee with more comprehensive information with which to better assess the future authorization requests for heating plants.

PART A—ARMY

The Army request under title I of S. 2364 amounted to $3,687,174,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Army request, approves the following programs.

	Army request	Total authorization
Military construction:		
Inside the United States	$1,444,100,000	$1,542,870,000
Outside the United States	594,120,000	489,050,000
Design	190,000,000	160,000,000
Minor construction	33,000,000	33,000,000
Access roads	500,000	0
Total military construction	2,261,720,000	2,224,920,000
Military family housing:		
Construction, improvements, and design	156,800,000	108,858,000
Support	1,268,654,000	1,246,754,000
Total family housing	1,425,454,000	1,355,612,000
Grand total, Army authorization	3,687,174,000	3,580,532,000
Less:		
MILCON projects authorized to be funded with savings (inside United States)		−118,200,000
Reduction for prior year savings:		
MILCON (inside United States, −$15,600,000; outside United States, −$65,000,000)		−80,600,000
Family housing (construction and improvement −$20,000,000)		−20,000,000
Grand total Army authorization for appropriation		3,361,732,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the military construction, Army, program as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Army request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
U.S. Army Forces Command	$721,720	$797,940
U.S. Army Western Command	44,700	44,700
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command	238,310	264,910
Military District of Washington	700	700
U.S. Army Material Development and Readiness Command	239,570	235,520
Army Ammunition Plants	30,120	30,120
U.S. Army Communications Command	5,670	5,670
U.S. Military Academy	950	950
U.S. Army Health Service Command	138,850	138,850
Military Traffic Management Command	3,310	3,310

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Army request	Committee approved
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	3,600	3,600
Ballistic Missile Defense System Command	12,800	12,800
Special support	3,800	3,800
Total inside the United States	1,444,100	1,542,870
Outside the United States:		
USARJ	1,900	1,900
Eighth U.S. Army	121,340	115,840
U.S. Army Forces Command	69,200	7,200
U.S. Army, Europe	332,280	294,710
U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command	2,400	2,400
U.S. Army Western Command	67,000	67,000
Total outside the United States	594,120	489,050
Access roads	500	0
Minor construction	33,000	33,000
Planning and design	190,000	160,000
Total support	223,500	193,000
Total military construction authorization	2,261,720	2,224,920
Less:		
Projects authorized to be funded with savings (inside United States)		−118,200
Reduction for prior year savings (inside United States)		−15,600
Reduction for prior year savings (outside United States)		−65,000
Total reduction military construction		−198,800
Total military construction authorization for appropriation		2,026,120

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Facility category	Army request	Committee approved
Operations and training	$380,860	$340,110
Maintenance and production	405,410	401,210
Army ammunition plants	30,120	30,120
Research, development, test, and evaluation	48,450	48,450
Supply	83,120	71,900
Medical	506,650	506,650
Administrative	44,900	77,900
Housing and community	338,320	351,720
Utilities and ground improvements	200,390	203,860
Access roads	500	0
Minor construction	33,000	33,000
Planning and design	190,000	160,000
Total military construction	2,261,720	2,224,920
Less:		
Projects authorized to be funded with savings		−118,200
Reduction for prior year savings		−80,600
Total reduction, military construction		−198,800
Total militay construction authorization for appropration		2,026,120

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $42,130,000 for five water pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved $47,210,000 for 24 energy conservation investment projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

CORRECTION OF OSHA DEFICIENCIES

The committee approved $1,700,000 for one OSHA project. The project is listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for most of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved $797,940,000 for 95 projects at the following 15 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Bragg, N.C.:	
Physical fitness training center	$3,750
Range control building	1,000
Tactical equipment shop	7,400
Aircraft maintenance facility	11,400
Multi-purpose training range	11,600
Barracks	15,500
Dining facility	2,500
Electronics/communications repair shop	860
Energy monitoring and control system	1,100
Heating plant modifications	1,000
Insulate buildings	2,250
Parachute rigging facility	800
Security operations training facility	39,000
Total	98,160
Fort Campbell, Ky.:	
Company administration and supply	3,200
Tactical equipment shop	5,000
Aircraft maintenance facility	9,800
Scheduled maintenance platforms	840
Total	18,840
Fort Carson, Colo.:	
Ammunition storage	3,100
Range roads	2,200
Utilities	8,000
Operations building	2,600
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	[1] 1,800
Warehouse	[1] 1,400

Location and project	*Thousands*
Tactical equipment shop	8,700
Do	7,200
Total	35,000
Fort Devens, Mass.:	
Correct safety deficiencies	1,700
Water distribution system upgrade	2,750
Total	4,450
Fort Drum, N.Y.:	
Vehicle wash facility	350
Energy monitoring and control system	290
Ammunition storage	700
Physical fitness training center	3,400
Total	4,740
Fort Hood, Tex.:	
Tactical equipment shop	7,000
Water storage	[1] 5,800
Flight simulator building	3,350
Company administration and supply	500
Tactical equipment shop	1,350
Do	1,100
Do	940
Brigade headquarters	1,000
Electrical substation	5,600
Military operations in urban terrain	7,300
Multipurpose training range	3,250
Corps headquarters facility	[1] 33,000
Total	70,190
Fort Irwin, Calif.:	
Vehicle fuel distribution	1,950
Military personnel and family service center	650
Electronics/communications repair shop	500
Sewage treatment plant effluent disposal	780
Automated data processing building	3,900
Flood protection at sewage treatment plant	990
Multipurpose training range	1,800
Bivouac facility with dining	1,950
Dental clinic	3,300
Land acquisition	2,100
Total	17,920
Fort Lewis, Wash.:	
New Madigan Army Medical Center	353,000
Tactical equipment shop	1,400
Insulate buildings	2,850
Water pollution abatement	740
Dining facilities modernization	800
Tactical equipment shop	940
Total	359,730
Fort Meade, Md.: Insulate buildings	5,900
Fort Ord, Calif.:	
Dining facilities modernization	700
Military operations in urban terrain	5,100

Location and project	*Thousands*
Aircraft parking apron	860
Wastewater treatment plant	8,300
Total	14,960
Fort Polk, La.:	
Ammunition storage	19,000
Barracks	8,200
Aircraft maintenance facility	10,000
Physical fitness training center	2,050
Total	39,250
Fort Richardson, Alaska:	
Dining facility modernization	2,150
Child care center addition	1,000
Barracks modernization	4,200
Total	7,350
Fort Riley, Kans.:	
Ammunition storage	3,700
Battalion headquarters and classroom	2,700
Energy monitoring and control system	650
Insulate buildings	300
Tactical equipment shop	4,750
Battalion headquarters and classroom	1,550
Company administration and supply	1,450
Hardstand	4,850
Tactical equipment shop addition	3,250
Tactical equipment shop	9,700
Company administration and supply	900
Total	33,800
Fort Stewart, Ga.:	
Automated data processing building	1,900
Tactical equipment shop	7,400
Barracks with dining facility	10,500
Child care center	3,200
Water pollution abatement	690
Multipurpose training range	20,000
Parachute drying tower	960
Tactical equipment shop	16,500
Physical fitness training center	5,300
Total	66,450
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.:	
Barracks with dining facility	11,400
Administration building	1,000
Child care center	2,200
Barracks	6,600
Total	21,200

[1] Added by the committee. To be constructed with savings.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Bragg, N.C.: Flight simulator building	**[1] $1,750**
Fort Campbell, Ky.:	
Flight simulator building	**[1] 2,750**
Fort Devens, Mass.: Waste heat recovery system	**[2] 280**

[1] Deferred due to late equipment delivery.

[2] Low savings-to-investment ratio.

U.S. ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

The commander of the U.S. Army Western Command (WESTCOM) commands and supports assigned and attached Active and Army Reserve units, installations and activities in Hawaii and possessions and trust territories in the Pacific administered by the U.S.

The committee approved $44,700,000 for ten projects at the following three locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Hawaii:	
Warehouse	$2,050
Detached latrines	930
Total	2,980
Helemano Military Reservation: Barracks modernization	4,650
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii:	
Tactical equipment shop	12,800
Physical fitness training center	5,350
Tactical equipment shop	5,700
Barracks modernization	8,000
Energy monitoring and control system	3,100
Storm drainage	420
Infantry remote target system ranges	1,700
Total	37,070

U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) is responsible for the Army school system and the principal combat development activities of the Army. It is responsible for individual training for members of the active Army and for Army Reserve component personnel assigned to TRADOC schools and activities.

The committee approved $264,910,000 for 40 projects at the following 16 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Belvoir, Va.:	
Computer systems design facility	$31,200
Communications facility	11,200
Total	42,400
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Barracks	[1] 13,400
Fort Benning, Ga.:	
Barracks	18,600
Applied instruction building	11,000
Tactical equipment shop	6,700
Company administration and supply	1,350
Total	37,650
Fort Bliss, Tex.:	
General instruction building	16,000
Dining facilities modernization	3,700
Tactical equipment shop	4,850
Total	24,550
Fort Dix, N.J.:	
Energy monitoring and control system	3,500

Location and project	*Thousands*
Infantry remote target system ranges	2,600
Insulate buildings	7,100
Upgrade range facilities	4,450
Total	17,650
Fort Eustis, Va.: Tactical equipment shop	3,300
Fort Gordon, Ga.:	
General instruction building	6,500
Child care center	2,000
Dental clinic	3,900
Total	12,200
Fort Jackson, S.C.:	
Infantry remote target system ranges	2,600
Dining facilities modernization	860
Troop medical clinic	4,000
Barracks	17,500
Applied instruction facility	[1] 14,000
Total	38,960
Fort Knox, Ky.:	
Communications facility	1,600
Ammunition storage	7,800
Infantry remote target system ranges	2,500
Tracked vehicle basic driving course	1,700
Total	13,600
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Unaccompanied officer housing	11,000
Fort Lee, Va.: Operations building	1,150
Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.:	
Infantry remote target system ranges	2,800
Applied instruction building	3,650
Total	6,450
Fort McClellan, Ala.:	
Dining facilities modernization	1,700
Upgrade range facilities	3,100
Training ranges	1,500
Total	6,300
Fort Rucker, Ala.: Flight simulator building	2,600
Fort Sill, Okla.:	
Physical fitness training center	5,250
Infantry remote target system ranges	2,250
Training ranges	1,600
Barracks	18,300
Total	27,400
Fort Story, Va.: Maintenance facility	6,100

[1] Added by the committee. To be constructed with savings.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Knox, Ky.: Gun synchronization ramps	[1] $800

[1] Army deferred to achieve a budget reduction.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

The commander of Military District of Washington (MDW) commands the troop units in the immediate Washington, D.C. area and is responsible for the operation of the installations under his jurisdiction.

The committee approved $700,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Myer, Va.: Religious education facility	$700

U.S. ARMY MATERIEL DEVELOPMENT AND READINESS COMMAND

The U.S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command (DARCOM) is responsible for integrated, systemized management of the Army's wholesale materiel activities. The wholesale activities responsibilities range from research through acquisition and distribution to disposal.

The committee approved $235,520,000 for 29 projects at the following 17 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.:	
Chapel and child care center	$4,950
Chemical biological defense laboratory	20,000
Vibration test laboratory	4,950
Operations building	10,400
Applied instruction building	7,300
Total	47,600
Anniston Army Depot, Ala.:	
Health clinic	1,550
Tank test track modification	2,950
Total	4,500
Crane Army Ammunition Plant, In.: Ammunition surveillance facility	3,600
Fort Monmouth, N.J.:	
Air condition general instruction building	4,050
Barracks modernization	5,100
Operations building	3,600
Tactical equipment shop	2,900
Total	15,650
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pa.: Site acquisition and preparation	7,800
Picatinny Arsenal, N.J.:	
Water treatment plant	3,000
Sanitary sewer	6,400
Railroad track acquisition	380
Total	9,780
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Ark.: Water treatment plant	2,550
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Va.: Red water disposal facility	26,000
Red River Army Depot, Tex.: Technical training facility	830
Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Guided missile R&D facility	1,900
Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.:	
Administration building modernization	6,900

Location and project	*Thousands*
Modernize manufacturing facility-REARM	44,000
Total	50,900
Seneca Army Depot, N.Y.: Intrusion detection system	6,900
Sharpe Army Depot, Calif.: Western distribution facility	49,000
Sierra Army Depot, Calif.: Intrusion detection system	4,150
Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pa.:	
Physical fitness training center addition	240
Heating plant	570
Total	810
White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: Laboratory and test building	2,250
Yuma Proving Ground, Ariz.: Physical fitness training center	1,300

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Corpus Christi Army Depot, Tex.: Energy conservation measures	[1] $650
Hawthorne Army Ammunition Plant, Nev.: Ammunition surveillance facility	[2] 3,400

[1] Low savings to investment ratio.

[2] Scope change requires redesign.

ARMY AMMUNITION PLANTS

Army ammunition plants are used to produce conventional ammunition in support of war reserve, consumption, and training requirements including support to the other Services and selected allies.

The committee approved $30,120,000 for 13 projects at the following six locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tenn.:	
Precipitator access platform area-A	$230
Improve coal handling facilities	7,000
Modernize explosive production facilities	7,800
Modernize composition C-4 facility—line 8	3,900
Expand lacquer preparation facility	910
Total	19,840
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Ind.: Propelling charge qualification facility	1,900
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa:	
Install blowout roofs on two buildings	690
Upgrade air-conditioning—two buildings	1,100
Total	1,790
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, La.: Chemical laboratory	1,600
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Va.:	
120mm propellant blending/packout facility	460
Replace explosion protection barricades	2,150
Replace barricade and processing building	330
Total	2,940
Scranton Army Ammunition Plant, Pa.: Replace water distribution system	2,050

U.S. ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

The U.S. Army Communications Command (USACC) has worldwide responsibilities for engineering, installing, operating, and maintaining the Army portion of the defense communications system and for providing, operating, and maintaining the Army's communications-electronics facilities.

The committee approved $5,670,000 for three projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.:	
Library	$1,250
General instruction building	3,900
Heating and cooling system upgrade	520
Total	5,670

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The U.S. Military Academy is responsible for instructing and training the corps of cadets in academic studies which are designed to lead the members to becoming commissioned officers of the Regular Army.

The committee approved $950,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
U.S. Military Academy, N.Y.:	
Upgrade range facilities	$630
Raw water line improvements	320
Total	950

U.S. ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Health Services Command (HSC) is responsible for providing Army health services to authorized recipients in the United States and its territories. It is the principal proponent and developer of concepts, doctrine, materiel requirements, and organizations for the health care system for the Army in field environments.

The committee approved $138,850,000 for six projects at the following four locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colo.: Insulate buildings	$650
Fort Detrick, Md.:	
Fire station	1,200
Medical intelligence operations facility	3,600
Standby generator plant	13,600
Total	18,400
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii: Hospital addition/alteration	115,000
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Va: Hospital food services facility alterations	4,800

U.S. ARMY MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

The U.S. Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) is the Department of Defense single manager for traffic management, land transportation, and common user ocean terminals.

The committee approved $3,310,000 for four projects at the following two locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, N.J.: Standby electric power	$570
Oakland Army Base, Calif.:	
Child care center	730
Insulate buildings	860
Energy efficient lighting	1,150
Total	2,740

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS COMMAND

The mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Command is to exercise command and operational control of and provide support to assigned engineer divisions, districts, research and development organizations and designated field activities engaged in world-wide military construction and civil works programs.

The committee approved $3,600,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Cold Regions Laboratory, N.H.: Laboratory refrigeration system upgrade	$3,600

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The mission of the Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command (BMDSC) is to coordinate and control all work and associated resources in testing and logistical support involved in developing effective ballistic missile defense systems.

The committee approved $12,800,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska: Guided missile facility	$12,800

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

U.S. ARMY, JAPAN

The U.S. Army, Japan (USARJ) maintains bases in Japan to provide supply maintenance, storage, procurement, transportation, engineering, medical and other essential services required to support USARJ operational plans with a capability for expansion when needed.

The committee approved $1,900,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Japan:	
Airfield operations building	$1,400
Heating fuel storage	500
Total	1,900

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY

The Eighth U.S. Army provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for U.S. Army units assigned to Korea.

The committee approved $115,840,000 for 53 projects in Korea at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Korea:	
Religious education facility	$640
Headquarters	6,000
Security lighting	3,700
Troop medical and dental clinic	5,400
Barracks	5,700
Dining facility	1,500
Do	2,300
Do	1,250
Aircraft maintenance facility	5,300
Barracks	2,400
Physical fitness training center	1,150
Do	1,050
Tactical equipment shop	1,000
Sewage treatment plant improvements	450
Utilities	2,100
Physical fitness training center	2,200
Warehouse	2,950
Barracks	4,050
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	850
Troop medical and dental clinic	2,750
Physical fitness training center	1,800
Do	1,900
Do	1,050
Multi-purpose training range	7,900
Infantry remote target system ranges	3,850
Dining facility	870
Barracks	630
Do	1,650
Do	620
Tactical equipment shop	900
Dining facility	1,150
Ammunition storage	290
Barracks	1,650
Company administration and supply	450
Company supply facility	580
Do	270
Hardstand	4,900
Barracks	2,400
Company administration and supply	440
Barracks	810
Do	610
Do	3,900
Do	3,050
Ammunition storage	810
Barracks	1,150
Security operations building	720
Barracks	1,600
Do	6,000
Do	1,050
Tactical equipment shop	2,850
Do	1,100
Aircraft maintenance facility	2,550
Barracks	3,600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Korea:	
Warehouse	[1] $3,100

Location and project	*Thousands*
Flight simulator building	[2] 2,400
Total	5,500

[1] Siting problems.
[2] Deferred due to late equipment delivery.

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for the bulk of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved $7,200 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Honduras:	
Contingency facility	$4,300
Prestock point	2,900
Total	7,200

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Location OCONUS: Rapid deployment force facilities	[1] $62,000

[1] Country-to-country agreement not complete.

U.S. ARMY, EUROPE

The U.S. Army, Europe, provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for the U.S. Army, Europe, and the Seventh Army.

The committee appproved $294,710,000 for 74 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Germany:	
Operations building addition	$960
Insulate buildings	1,050
Intelligence training facility	1,200
Tactical equipment shop	5,100
Operations building	3,250
Warehouse	1,350
Dental clinic	2,000
Tactical equipment shop and hardstand	10,800
Troop medical and dental clinic	2,450
Physical fitness training center	3,150
Brigade headquarters	1,450
Automatic heat control systems	300
Automation of coal fired heating plant	2,500
Insulate buildings	770
Barracks	9,500
Insulate buildings	1,300
Waste heat recovery system	800
Dining facility	1,800
Tactical equipment shop	710
Utilities	5,500
Tactical equipment shop	11,600
Barracks	12,000
Battalion headquarters	1,550
Heating plant	3,900
Hardstand	760

Location and project	*Thousands*
Troop medical and dental clinic	2,750
Hardstand	650
Confinement facility addition	1,300
Paved roads	2,800
Vehicle wash facility	1,450
Aircraft parking apron	[1] 12,000
Tactical equipment shop	7,700
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	900
Tactical equipment shop	9,900
Ammunition surveillance facility	7,300
Tactical equipment shop	3,350
Do	4,200
Maintenance facility	7,400
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	2,700
Barracks	10,800
Barracks modernization	2,450
Electrical distribution system	3,000
Heating plant	9,400
Military clothing sales store	360
Vehicle wash facility	1,700
Insulate buildings	4,100
Heating system renovation	4,600
Aircraft maintenance facility	19,000
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	700
Do	920
Vehicle wash facility	3,550
Troop medical and dental clinic	2,800
Do	2,950
Small caliber range	290
Dining facility	2,550
Tactical equipment shop	13,200
Barracks	10,600
Fuel tanker facility	3,550
Tactical equipment shop	16,000
Do	5,500
Dining facility	1,650
Barracks	4,800
Warehouse	1,900
Tactical equipment shop	5,300
Flight simulator building	2,700
Small arms repair shop	460
Total	284,980
Various locations, Greece:	
Multipurpose recreation facility	1,150
Do	960
Unaccompanied personnel housing	1,100
Barracks modernization	660
Unaccompanied personnel housing	1,800
Barracks modernization	660
Barracks with dining facility	2,350
Multipurpose recreation facility	1,050
Total	9,730

[1] Partial reduction from $19 million request.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, Germany:	
Ammunitions Storage—phase 1	[1] $670
Ammunitions Storage	[1] 730
Do	[1] 530
Do	[1] 1,150
Do	[1] 510
Do	[1] 930

Location and project	*Thousands*
Do	[1] 780
Do	[1] 1,850
Do	[1] 870
Paved roads	[2] 1,400
Ammunitions Storage	[1] 1,500
Purchase of support facilities	[3] 16,300
Flight simulator building	[4] 3,350
Total	30,570

[1] Seek NATO funding or propose alternate storage system.
[2] Requirement no longer exists.
[3] Seek NATO or host nation funding.
[4] Deferred due to late equipment delivery.

U.S. ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

The commander the U.S. Army Western Command (WESTCOM) commands and supports assigned and attached Active and Army Reserve units, installations and activities in Hawaii and possessions and trust territories in the Pacific administered by the U.S.

The committee approved $67,000,.000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Johnston Island:	
Ammunition storage	$21,000
Chemical agent disposal facility	46,000
Total	67,000

U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND

The U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command is responsbile for peforming intelligence functions in support of Army field commanders and in fulfillment and support of those national intelligence responsibilities assigned to the Army.

The committee approved $2,400,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Location 177:	
Warehouse	$350
Barracks	2,050
Total	2,400

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The minor construction section contains unspecified projects having a funded cost of $1,000,000 or less, including construction, alteration, or conversion of permanent or temporary facilities. An amount of $33,000,000 has been designated for unspecified locations.

PROJECTS COSTING $1,000,000 OR LESS

Projects at specific locations costing $1,000,000 or less have been included in the station totals in this year's bill.

SUMMARY OF ARMY PROGRAM ACTIONS

A summary of actions taken on the request of the Army is tabulated by project as follows:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Army request	$3,261,720
United States Forces Command:	
Fort Bragg, N.C.: Flight simulator building	−1,750
Fort Campbell, Ky.:	
Flight simulator building	−2,750
Fort Carson, Colo.:	
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	+1,800
Warehouse	+1,400
Fort Devens, Mass.: Waste heat recovery system	−280
Fort Hood, Tex.:	
Water storage	+5,800
Corps headquarters facility	+33,000
United States Army Training and Doctrine Command:	
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Barracks	+13,400
Fort Jackson, S.C.: Applied instruction facility	+14,000
Fort Knox, Ky.: Gun synchronization ramps	−800
United States Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command:	
Corpus Christi, Tex.: Energy conservation measures	−650
Hawthorne AAP: Ammunition surveillance facility	−3,400
Eighth United States Army:	
Various Locations, Korea:	
Warehouse	−3,100
Flight simulator building	−2,400
United States Army Forces Command, overseas:	
Rapid deployment force facilities	−62,000
United States Army, Europe:	
Various locations, Germany:	
Ammunition storage—phase 1	−670
Ammunition storage	−730
Do	−530
Do	−1,150
Do	−510
Do	−930
Do	−780
Do	−1,850
Do	−870
Paved roads	−1,400
Aircraft Parking apron	−7,000
Ammunition storage	−1,500
Purchase of support facilities	−16,300
Flight simulator building	−3,350
Access roads	−500
Planning and design	−25,000
Mobilization planning and design	−5,000
Subtotal of actions	−85,600
Total, military construction for authorization	2,224,920
Projects to be accomplished from savings	−118,200
Reduction for prior year savings	−80,600
Total, military construction authorization for appropriations	2,026,120

FAMILY HOUSING

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the Army Family Housing program as follows:

ARMY FAMILY HOUSING

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Army request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing (953 units requested)	$34,063	$6,121
Post acquisition construction	108,822	88,822
Planning and design	13,915	13,915
Total construction	156,800	108,858
Operation and maintenance (156,710 units):		
Operating expenses	542,838	540,938
Maintenance	596,521	576,521
Total operation and maintenance	1,139,359	1,117,459
Leasing:		
Foreign (19,482 units)	107,249	107,249
Domestic (26 units)	129	129
Total leasing	107,378	107,378
Debt payment:		
Principal	20,054	20,054
Interest and other expenses	1,639	1,639
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	224	224
Total debt payment	21,917	21,917
Total Army family housing request	1,425,454	1,355,612
Less:		
Reduction for prior year savings		20,000
Total authorized for appropriations, Army family housing		1,335,612

The Army Family Housing program authorization for appropriations request totaled $1,425,454,000. The total request of $1,425,454,000 compares with $1,272,639,000 for fiscal year 1984.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $6,121,000 for 80 units of new construction and the acquisition of 125 units at Sierra Army Depot, California, primarily for junior non-commissioned officers.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location	Units	Cost
Sierra Army Depot, California	80	$5,721
Do	125	[1] 400

[1] Committee approved $400,000 of $1,253,000 request to allow the Army to purchase units at a more reasonable price or fence the property outside the post.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location	Units	Thousands
Babenhausen, Germany	106	[1] $8,856
Mainz, Germany	186	[1] 18,233

[1] Deferred without prejudice as the Army has thus far been unable to execute contracts for family housing units authorized in fiscal year 1984 to be built in the Federal Republic of Germany.

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $88,822,000 for improvements to existing family housing units at installations inside the United States; installations in Korea; and communities in Germany as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	*Cost*
Regular improvements	$68,980
Energy conservation investment	19,842

The committee has deferred without prejudice $20,000,000 of the $88,980,000 Army request for regular improvements in order to obtain a budgetary reduction.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved $13,915,000 for architectural and engineering service and construction design. These funds will be used to plan for and design future year projects as well as complete the design of fiscal year 1985 projects in new construction, improvements and energy conservation. Accordingly, the committee approved the amount requested.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved $1,117,459,000 for operation and maintenance of the fiscal year 1985 estimated average inventory of 156,710 family housing units. Reimbursements are anticipated to be $13,800,000. This is a reduction of $1,900,000 as a result of the Army's improved estimate of fuel costs and a $20,000,000 committee reduction in the maintenance account in order to obtain a budgetary reduction. The committee realizes that this reduction, unfortunately, will affect the Army's capability to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance and repair.

LEASING

The committee approved $107,249,000 for foreign leasing. The committee is aware of the Army requirement to remedy its housing shortfalls in foreign countries through a program of both new construction and foreign leasing dependent upon which is the most economical to accomplish.

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

Total request	$1,425,454
Babenhausen, Germany: New Construction	−8,856
Mainz, Germany: New Construction	−18,233
Sierra Army Depot: Acquisition	[1] −853
Post Aquisition Construction	−20,000
Operations	−1,900
Maintenance	−20,000
Subtotal of actions	−69,842
Total, family housing authorization	1,355,612
Less: Reduction for prior year savings	−20,000
Total, family housing authorization for appropriation	1,335,612

---

[1] Partial reduction.

PART B—NAVY

Under part B of title II the Navy requested $1,781,200,000 for major construction and $727,886,000 for family housing for a total of $2,509,086,000. After careful review and consideration of the Navy's request, the committee approved a program of $2,351,581,000 as shown in the following tabulation:

	Navy request	Committee approved
Inside the United States	$1,262,485,000	$1,241,555,000
Outside the United States	195,815,000	197,070,000
Unspecified minor	19,000,000	19,000,000
Architectural and engineering services and construction design	157,900,000	140,900,000
Access roads	4,000,000	4,000,000
Santa Margarita water project	142,000,000	142,000,000
Family housing	727,886,000	687,056,000
Total, Navy authorization	2,509,086,000	2,431,581,000
Milcon projects authorized to be funded with savings		−27,720,000
Undistributed reduction for savings		−52,280,000
Grand total, Navy, authorization for appropriations		2,351,581,000

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY AUTHORIZATION

[Dollars in thousands]

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
Marine Corps	$224,330	$224,330
Chief of Naval Research	31,650	31,650
Chief of Naval Operations	41,300	21,550
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet	150,050	148,650
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet	201,170	202,860
Naval Education and Training Command	85,575	87,565
Naval Medical Command	40,320	40,320
Naval Material Command	479,845	476,385
Naval Oceanography Command	1,945	1,945
Naval Telecommunications Command	1,160	1,160
Naval Security Group Command	5,140	5,140
Subtotal inside the United States	1,262,485	1,241,555
Outside the United States:		
Marine Corps	9,150	9,150
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet	50,550	67,760
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet	50,845	50,350
Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe	54,370	44,740
Naval Material Command	230	230
Naval Medical Command	18,400	18,400
Naval Telecommunications Command	8,440	2,610
Naval Security Group Command	1,040	1,040
Host Nation Infrastructure Support	2,790	2,790
Subtotal outside the United States	195,815	197,070

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY AUTHORIZATION—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Total	1,458,300	1,438,625
Unspecified minor construction	19,000	19,000
Architectural and engineering services and construction design	157,900	140,900
Access roads	4,000	4,000
Grand total	1,639,200	1,602,525

FACILITY CLASSES SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Description	Request			Committee approved		
	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Navy	Marine Corps	Total
Operational	$250,515	$20,720	$271,235	$256,450	$20,720	$277,170
Training	76,685	14,690	91,375	73,525	14,690	88,215
Maintenance and production	291,705	40,100	331,805	283,815	40,100	323,915
RDT&E	58,070	0	58,070	58,070	0	58,070
Supply	48,405	15,140	63,545	47,195	15,140	62,335
Medical	62,115	0	62,115	62,115	0	62,115
Administrative	97,125	18,430	115,555	93,205	18,430	111,635
Troop housing	119,840	98,420	218,260	140,840	98,420	239,260
Community	44,930	4,810	49,740	22,500	4,810	27,310
Utilities	115,080	14,490	129,570	115,770	14,490	130,260
Energy conservation	26,650	0	26,650	26,650	0	26,650
Water pollution abatement	11,110	1,930	13,040	11,110	1,930	13,040
Real estate	19,800	4,750	24,550	11,110	4,750	15,860
Subtotal	1,222,030	233,480	1,455,510	1,202,355	233,480	1,435,835
Access roads			4,000			4,000
Unspecified minor construction			19,000			19,000
Architectural and engineering services and construction design			157,900			140,900
NATO			2,790			2,790
Subtotal			1,639,200			1,602,525
General reduction						−80,000
Total MCON			1,639,200			1,522,525

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $13,040,000 for eight pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved $26,650,000 for 20 energy conservation projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MARINE CORPS

The committee approved $224,330,000 for 49 projects at the following 16 locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
MCLB, Barstow, Calif.: Security warehouse	$5,670
MCAS, Beaufort, S.C.:	
Operational trainer facility	760
Constuction and weight handling equipment shop	1,950
Oil spill prevention	780
Total	3,490
Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, Hawaii: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,910
MCB, Camp Lejeune, N.C.:	
Combat vehicle maintenance shop	2,190
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	16,800
Division headquarters	9,380
Water treatment facilities improvements	8,000
Total	36,370
MCB, Camp Pendleton, Calif.:	
Fuel storage facility	3,340
Mountain warfare training facility (MWTC Bridgeport)	1,480
Operational trainer facility (MCAF)	3,120
Maintenance hangar (MCAF)	4,700
Tactical vehicle maintenance facility	1,680
Tactical vehicle maintenance facilities	8,500
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	23,900
Enlisted dining facility modernization	2,610
Chapel, religious education and instructional facility	2,360
Child care center	2,450
Hazardous waste facility	440
Total	54,580
MCAS, Cherry Point, N.C.:	
Combat aircraft ordnance loading area	3,320
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	10,000
Tactical support van pads	1,490
Total	14,810
MCAS, El Toro, Calif.:	
Wing headquarters	4,610
Land acquisition	4,750
High explosive magazines	2,690
Combat aircraft ordnance loading area	4,880
Small arms range—outdoor	680
Total	17,610
MCAS, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii:	
Water distribution system improvements	6,490
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing modernization	7,610

Location and project	*Cost*
Combat aircraft ordnance loading area	2,440
Total	16,540
MCAS, New River, N.C.: Hazardous and flammable storehouse	340
MCRD, Parris Island, S.C.:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing modernization	2,550
Recruit barracks improvement	3,680
Recruit barracks	4,990
Total	11,220
MCD&EC, Quantico, Va.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing modernization	3,710
MCRD, San Diego, Calif.:	
Recruit training facility	8,650
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	9,920
Total	18,570
MCAS, Tustin, Calif.:	
Maintenance hangar	13,200
Engine test cell	1,140
Oilspill prevention	710
Total	15,050
MCAGCC, Twentynine Palms, Calif.:	
Battalion headquarters	1,900
Ammunition storage facilities	4,830
Armory	1,100
Total	7,830
MARBARRACKS, Washington, D.C.: Building Modernization	2,540
MCAS, Yuma, Ariz.:	
Parachute and survial equipment shop	790
Missile equipment maintenance shop	1,900
Cold storage warehouse	660
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	10,740
Total	14,090

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

The Office of Naval Research encourages, promotes, plans, initiates, and coordinates naval research as related to the maintenance of future naval power and the preservation of national security.

The committee approved $31,650,000 for three projects at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NRL, Washington, D.C.:	
Optics laboratory	$10,850
Facilities energy improvements	1,380
Mission operations support center	19,420
Total	31,650

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Under the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations exercises command over certain central executive organizations, assigned shore activities, and the operating forces of the Navy.

The committee approved $21,550,000 for four projects at the following four locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NA, Annapolis, Md.: Boat repair facility modernization	$1,960
NAVSAFECEN, Norfolk, Va.: Naval safety center	3,640
NARDAC, San Diego, Calif.: Data processing center	15,700
PERSPTACT, Washington, D.C.: Pay and personnel support office (NOS Indian Head, Md.)	250

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Cost*
COMNAVDIST, Washington, D.C.: Administrative office	[1] $19,750

[1] Move of more personnel to the Navy Yard not justified. Navy to look for other siting options.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet exercises operational, organizational planning, logistic and administrative command over air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations.

The committee approved $148,650,000 for 32 projects at the following 11 locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAS, Brunswick, Maine:	
Alert force building addition	$340
Land acquisition	2,170
Total	2,510
NS, Charleston, S.C.:	
Electrical distribution lines	5,630
Fleet support center	6,300
Total	11,930
NAS, Jacksonville, Fla.:	
Maintenance hangar improvements	6,560
Religious education building	840
Total	7,400
NAB, Little Creek, Va.:	
Applied instruction building	730
Landing craft air cushion complex	19,400
Pier utilities	6,210
Heating plant improvements	1,580
Total	27,920
NS, Mayport, Fla.:	
Bulkhead	5,870
Construction battalion unit complex	1,410
Security building	780
Wharf utilities improvement	400

Location and project	*Cost*
Waterfront utilities	1,480
Total	9,940
NSB, New London, Conn.:	
Berthing pier improvements	2,240
Quaywall	5,100
Do	2,770
Utilities improvement and land acquisition	12,000
Security improvements	890
Total	23,000
LANTFLTHDQSPTACT, Norfolk, Va.: Operations command center addition	24,700
NS, Norfolk, Va.:	
General purpose berthing pier	15,100
Communications training facility	345
Security building	850
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	8,100
Transformer stations	6,220
Total	30,615
NAS, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft ground support equipment shop	3,600
PERSPTACT, Norfolk, Va.:	
Pay and personnel support office (NAB Little Creek)	1,030
Pay and personnel support office (NAS Oceana)	1,350
Pay and personnel support office (NS Roosevelt Roads)	1,090
Total	3,470
NAS, Oceana, Va.:	
Aircraft service points	3,000
Hazardous and flammable storehouse	565
Total	3,565

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Cost*
NAS, Oceana, Va.: Land acquisition	[1] $7,700

[1] Navy offered this reduction.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet exercises operational, organizational planning, logistic and administrative command over air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations.

The committee approved $202,860,000 for 38 projects at the following 22 locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NF, Adak, Alaska: Base support facilities	$3,900
NS, Adak, Alaska: Chapel and religious education building	5,140
NAS, Alameda, Calif.:	
Ventilation improvements	580
Telephone lines	690
Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning	4,540
Total	5,810

Location and project	*Cost*
NSB, Bangor, Wash: Facility energy improvements	440
NAS, Barbers Point, Hawaii:	
Avionics shop	5,250
Operational trainer facility addition	1,380
Total	6,630
NAB, Coronado, Calif:	
Special warfare operations building	3,420
Fiberglass and painting facility	2,100
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing (MCB Camp Pendleton)	3,220
Total	8,740
NAF, El Centro, Calif.: Water treatment facilities	1,700
NAS, Fallon, Nev.:	
Explosives area improvement	4,740
Maintenance hangar	[1] 5,000
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[1] 12,900
Unaccompanied officer housing	[1] 8,100
Aircraft direct fueling station	[1] 3,700
Total	34,440
NAS, Lemoore, Calif.: Boiler plant modifications	580
NS, Long Beach, Calif.: Child care center	1,100
SIMA, Long Beach, Calif.: Shore intermediate maintenance facility	11,700
NM, Lualualei, Hawaii: Ordnance operations buildings	3,130
NS, Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif.: Construction battalion unit complex	1,090
NAS, Miramar, Calif.: Engine test cell	3,460
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif.:	
Taxiway improvements	3,950
Fire protection pipeline	1,730
Railroad dock	690
Total	6,370
NAS, North Island, Calif.: Observation tower (San Clemente Island)	1,190
COMOCEANOSYSPAC, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Terminal equipment building (NAS Whidbey Island)	17,000
NS, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Degaussing building	545
NSB, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	12,500
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	4,940
Operational storage	345
Bulkheads	1,030
Total	18,815
NS, San Diego, Calif.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	17,300
NSB, San Diego, Calif.: Pier extension	25,900
NAS, Whidbey Island Wash.:	
Maintenance hangar	6,820
Engine maintenance shop	8,930
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	12,130
Total	27,880

[1] Committee add.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Locations and project	*Cost*
NAS, North Island, Calif.: Maintenance hangar addition	[1] $5,190
NSB, San Diego, Calif.: Gymnasium	[1] 2,950
PERSPTACT, San Diego, Calif.: Pay and personnel support office	[1] 2,270

Locations and project	*Cost*
NS, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif.: Brig	[1] 17,600

[1] Navy offered this reduction.

NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

The Chief of Naval Education and Training is responsible for the education and training of all naval personnel.

The committee approved $87,565,000 for 38 projects at the following 21 locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
FBMSTC, Charleston, S.C.: Applied instruction building modifications	$710
NAS, Chase Field, Tex.:	
Electronics/Communications maintenance shop	425
High explosive magazines	690
Land acquisition	480
Energy monitoring and control system	1,100
Facility energy improvements	620
Total	3,315
NAS, Corpus Christi, Tex.:	
Operational trainer facility modernization	545
Cold storage warehouse	550
Land acquisition	2,960
Child care center	620
Total	4,675
PERSPTACT, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Pay and personnel support office (NAS Kingsville)	710
NTC, Great Lakes, Ill.:	
Recruit processing building	9,990
Operational trainer facility	1,960
Total	11,950
NAS, Kingsville, Tex.: Public works shop	1,470
NAVPHIBSCH, Little Creek, Va.: Applied instruction building	725
FTC, Mayport, Fla.: Firefighting training facility	6,510
NAS, Memphis, Tenn.:	
Electrical distribution system improvements	1,700
Water treatment facility	5,540
Facility energy improvements	3,120
Total	10,360
NAS, Meridian, Miss.:	
Runway service road	[1] 690
Arming and dearming pads	[1] 1,300
Total	1,990
NETC, Newport, R.I.:	
Family services center	690
Pier utilities	3,160

Location and project	*Cost*
Sewage system	1,510
Total	5,360
FTC, Norfolk, Va.: Applied instruction building	4,450
NTC, Orlando, Fla.:	
Ships propulsion training building	1,460
Gymnasium	1,900
Facility energy improvements	360
Total	3,720
ND&STC, Panama City, Fla.: Free ascent tank	1,250
NAS, Pensacola, Fla.: Child care center	1,410
PERSPTACT, Pensacola, Fla.:	
Pay and personnel support office (NAS Pensacola)	1,480
Pay and personnel support office (NCBC Gulfport)	1,030
Total	2,510
NCTC, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Construction equipment training buildings	4,580
FASWTCPAC, San Diego, Calif.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,470
FTC, San Diego, Calif.: Applied instruction building	5,250
NTC, San Diego, Calif.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	8,300
NAS, Whiting Field, Fla.:	
Radar facility	820
Approach lighting	1,030
Total	1,850

[1] Committee add. To be funded with savings.

The committee approved two projects at the Meridian Naval Air Station, Mississippi. The first project in the amount of $690,000 is to construct new service roads to the runway ends. These roads will connect the aircraft parking apron to the outboard ends of three runways and will make it possible to perform maintenance or respond to emergencies without closing the runways to air traffic to accommodate service vehicles. The second project in the amount of $1,300,000 is to provide arming/dearming pads at Meridian Naval Air Station, Mississippi, for a safe area to arm and dearm aircraft.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

The Naval Medical Command safeguards and promotes the health of Navy and Marine Corps personnel, their dependents, and other personnel.

The committee approved $40,320,000 for seven projects at the following seven locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NH, Bremerton, Wash.: Medical clinic (Puget Sound NSY)	$6,220
NH, Camp Lejeune, N.C.: Aviation physiology training building (MCAS Cherry Point)	970
NH, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Medical/dental clinic (MWTC Bridgeport)	1,410
NH, Millington, Tenn.: Facility energy improvements	410
NH, Oakland, Calif.: Hospital modification	29,140
NH, Orlando, Fla.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,760
NH Portsmouth, Va.: Boiler plant modifications	410

NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

The Naval Material Command is the single integrated material support agency for the Navy. Its mission includes the development, procurement and support of total weapons systems, depot maintenance, supply management and facilities support.

The committee approved $476,385,000 for 71 projects at the following 37 locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NARF, Alameda, Calif.: Gun testing facility	$3,820
NSC, Bremerton, Wash.: Data processing center	6,160
NSC, Charleston, S.C.:	
Cold storage warehouse addition	2,930
Data processing center	2,700
Total	5,630
Charleston NSY, Charleston, S.C.:	
Facility energy improvements	570
Waterfront services support buildings	[1] 1,830
Logistics support facility	[1] 5,800
Total	8,200
NWS, Charleston, S.C.: Portable water storage tank	1,630
NWS, China Lake, Calif.: Ventilation improvements	630
NSWC, Dahlgren, Va.:	
Computation and analysis laboratory addition	1,330
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	700
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing and dining facility (Wallops Island)	2,950
Total	4,980
NPWC, Great Lakes, Ill.:	
Water distribution line	480
Steam and condensate systems	1,370
Total	1,850
NCBC, Gulfport, Miss.:	
Seabee military training building	1,860
War reserves warehouse	4,460
Medical clinic addition	325
Seabee regimental headquarters	2,590
Seabee battalion headquarters	2,800
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,650
Enlisted dining facility addition	1,580
Gymnasium	1,740
Elevated potable water storage tank	810
Total	20,815
NARF, Jacksonville, Fla.: Ventilation improvements	1,410
SUPSHIP, Jacksonville, Fla.: Administrative building (NS Mayport)	1,270
NSB, Kings Bay, Ga.:	
Refit wharf	33,000
Dredging	[2] 23,200
Strategic weapons facility (Phase I)	81,700
Refit industrial facility	25,000
Waterfront services facility	6,770
Base administration building and communications center	7,320

Location and project	*Cost*
Community impact assistance	4,900
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,270
Utilities and site improvements	23,800
Total	209,960
Long Beach NSY, Long Beach, Calif.: Facility energy improvements	3,010
NSPCC, Mechanicsburg, Penn.:	
Administrative office modernization	1,170
Data processing center	15,100
Total	16,270
NUSC, Newport, R.I.:	
Submarine weapon systems integration laboratory	11,540
Command and control systems maintenance shop	13,300
Total	24,840
NARF, Norfolk, Va.: Jet engine overhaul shop modernization	10,000
NSC, Norfolk, VA.: Fire protection systems	1,420
Norfolk, NSY, Portsmouth, Va.: Nuclear repair shop	11,330
NPWC, Norfolk, Va.: Electrical distribution lines	4,050
NARF, North Island, Calif.: Facility energy improvements	560
NSC, Oakland, Calif.:	
POL pump station	1,840
Hazardous and flammable storehouse	7,670
Total	9,510
NTEC, Orlando, Fla.: Training equipment center	23,500
NATC, Patuxent River, Md.:	
Family services center	520
Municipal sewer connection	3,500
Facility energy improvements	600
Total	4,620
NSC, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii:	
Fire protection systems	4,630
Data processing center improvements	2,050
Total	6,680
NPWC, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Electrical distribution systems improvements	5,270
NARF, Pensacola, Fla.:	
Manufacture and repair shop modernization	4,500
Facility energy improvements	690
Total	5,190
NPWC, Pensacola, Fla.: Water supply facilities addition	7,830
Philadelphia NSY, Philadelphia, Pa.: Municipal sewer connection	3,890
PMTC, Point Mugu, Calif.:	
Airframes shop	1,680
Electrical and electronics systems laboratory	12,700
Unaccompanied personnel housing (San Nicholas Island)	6,650
Total	21,030
Portsmouth NSY, Kittery, Maine: Engineering management building	[1] 11,800

Location and project	*Cost*
FCDSSACT, San Diego, Calif.: Computer programing operations center	11,250
NSC, San Diego, Calif.:	
Servmart (NS Long Beach)	2,670
Defense property disposal office scrapyard relocation	1,480
Total	4,150
NPWC, San Diego, Calif.: Administrative office	4,870
NPWC, San Francisco, Calif.:	
Wharf utilities (NSC Oakland)	7,650
Facility energy improvements	5,770
Total	13,420
NAVELECSYSENACT, St. Inigoes, Md.:	
Sewage system	510
Ships navigation equipment laboratory	1,600
Total	2,110
NADC, Warminster, Pa.: Electric powerplant	2,290
NWS, Yorktown, Va.: High explosive magazine	1,140

[1] Committee add. To be funded with savings.
[2] Navy offered reduction from $45,200,000.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Cost*
NPWC, Great Lakes, Ill.: Public works shop	[1] $890

[1] Navy offered this reduction.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

The Naval Oceanography Command provides research and operational data of the environment to support the Navy and other services. Data includes mapping, charting and geodesy publications.

The committee approved $1,945,000 for two projects at the following two locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVOCEANO, Bay St. Louis, Miss.: Data processing center addition	$1,570
NAVOCEANCMD, Bay St. Louis, Miss.: Administrative office	375

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

The Naval Telecommunications Command provides communications by satellite and radio for administrative functions and command and control of Navy ships.

The committee approved $1,160,000 for two projects at the following location.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVCAMSLANT, Norfolk, Va.:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing (NRTF Annapolis, Md.)	$760
Fire station (NRS Sugar Grove, W. Va.)	400
Total	1,160

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

The Naval Security Group Command is responsible for signal intelligence, protection of U.S. Navy signals and other exploitable emissions, special communications systems, technical research and development for the creation of new systems and equipment, and Navy-wide support of the Armed Forces Courier Service.

The committee approved $5,140,000 for three projects at the following three locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NSGA, Adak, Alaska: Antenna support facilities	$320
NSGANW, Chesapeake, Va.: Operations building addition	4,600
NSGA, Winter Harbor, Maine: Antenna support facilities	220

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MARINE CORPS

For the Marine Corps outside the United States, the committee approved $9,150,000 for five projects at the following two locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
MCAS, Iwakuni, Japan:	
Tactical support van pads	$4,150
Engine maintenance shop	1,780
Ventilation improvements	890
Total	6,820
MCB, Camp Butler, Okinawa Japan:	
Tactical vehicle maintenance shop	1,380
Ammunition magazines (Camp Fugi)	950
Total	2,330

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved $67,760,000 for 12 projects at the following five locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba:	
Refresher training building	$3,620
Gymnasium	2,860
Total	6,480
NS, Keflavik, Iceland:	
Aircraft operations building	1,980
Combined operations center	4,780
Squadron support facility	3,160
Fuel facilities	[1] 3,890
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	7,110
Power plant addition	5,630
Fueling pier	[2] 30,000
Total	56,550
NS, Panama Canal, Panama: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing.	1,580
NS, Roosevelt Roads, P.R.: Waterfront operations facilities	2,550

Location and project	*Cost*
LANTFLTWTF, Roosevelt Roads, P.R.: Land acquisition (St. Croix)	600

[1] Navy reduction from $10,900,000.
[2] Navy requested this project in fiscal year 1984 supplemental bill.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NS, Keflavik, Iceland: Operational trainer facility	[1] $3,160
NF, Keflavik, Iceland: Terminal equipment building addition	[1] 2,620

[1] Navy offered these reductions.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, outside the United States, the Committee approved $50,350,000 for 11 projects at the eight following locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAS, Cubi Point, R.P.:	
Maintenance hangar	$18,800
Engine test cell	4,940
Facility energy improvements	520
Total	24,260
NSF, Diego Garcia, I.O.: Water system improvements	5,930
NAS, Guam, M.I.: Energy recovery system	300
NSRF, Guam M.I.:	
Asbestos control facility	1,480
Hazardous materials storage and handling facility	860
Total	2,340
NAF, Misawa, Japan: High explosive magazine	9,300
NS, Subic Bay, R.P.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,520
NSRF, Subic Bay, R.P.: Ventilation improvements	710
FLTACTS, Yokosuka, Japan: Mooring dolphins	990

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NSF, Diego Garcia, I.O.: Lighted navigational range	[1] $495

[1] Navy offered this reduction.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

The Commander in Chief, Naval Forces Europe, commands the Naval component of the unified U.S. European Command.

The committee approved $44,740,000 for 13 projects at the following four locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
FOCCEUR, London, United Kingdom: Fleet command center	$2,620
NAVACTS, London, United Kingdom: Fleet hospital facilities (RAF Locking)	6,620
NS, Rota, Spain:	
Engine maintenance shop	3,850

Location and project	*Cost*
Ground support equipment shop	1,090
Engine test cell	5,800
Enlisted dining facility	1,530
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	3,910
Brig	820
Family services center	420
Pier extension	7,600
Total	25,020
NAS, Sigonella, Italy:	
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	2,910
Utilities improvements	5,640
Gymnasium addition	1,930
Total	10,480

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAS, Sigonella, Italy:	
Maintenance hangar	[1] $7,300
Automotive vehicle maintenance shop	[1] 1,340
Land acquisition	[2] 990

[1] Navy offered these reductions.
[2] Land should be furnished by host nation.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

The Naval Medical Command, outside the United States, safeguards and promotes the health of Navy and Marine Corps personnel, their dependents, and other personnel.

The committee approved $18,400,000 for a project at the following location.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NH, Rota, SP.: Hospital	$18,400

NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

The Naval Material Command, outside the United States, is the single integrated material support agency for the Navy. Its mission includes the development, procurement and support of total weapons systems, depot maintenance, supply management and facilities support.

The committee approved $230,000 for a project at the following location.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NPWC, Guam, M.I.: Ventilation improvements	$230

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

For the Naval Telecommunications Command, outside the United States, the committee approved $2,610,000 for three projects at the following three locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVCAMSWESTPAC, Guam, M.I.: Religious education and academic instruction facilities	$1,330
NCS, San Miguel, RP.: Lighting systems	300
NCS, Yokosuka, Japan: Public works shops addition	980

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVCAMSWESTPAC, Guam, M.I.: Theater	[1] $1,880
NCS, Nea Makri, Greece: Receiver building	[2] 3,950

[1] Navy offered this reduction.
[2] Base rights uncertain.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

For the Naval Security Group Command, outside the United States, the committee approved $1,040,000 for three projects and the following three locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NSGD, Diego Garcia, I.O.: Antenna support facilities	$380
NSGA, Edzell, S.T.: Antenna support facilities	340
NSGD, Guam, M.I.: Antenna support facilities	320

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Host Nation Infrastructure Support outside the United States will support NATO projects which the United States is host nation.

The committee approved $2,790,000 for a project at various locations.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Various Locations: Host nation infrastructure support	$2,790

VARIOUS AND CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS

The following projects are at various and classified locations. The committee approved $163,900,000 for three projects.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Various: Unspecified minor	[1] $19,000
Various: Architectural and engineering services and construction design	[2] 140,900
Various: Access roads	4,000

[1] $500,000 for Route 4 access improvement at NWS Concord, Calif., and $560,000 for fire station at NSGA Skaggs Island, Calif.
[2] Navy reduction from $157,900,000.

SANTA MARGARITA WATER PROJECT

The Secretary of the Navy may carry out a military construction project for water supply and flood control.

The committee approved $142,000,000 for a project at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
MCB, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Santa Margarita water project	$142,000

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM ACTION

A summary of actions taken on the request of the Navy is tabulated by project as follows:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Navy request	$1,781,200
Chief of Naval Operations: COMNAVDIST, Washington, D.C.: Administrative Office	−19,750
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet:	
NS, Charleston, S.C.: Fleet Support Center	[1] +6,300
NAS, Oceana, Va.: Land Acquisition	−7,700
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet:	
NAS Fallon, Nev.:	
Maintenance hangar	+5,000
Unaccompanied enlisted housing	+12,900
Unaccompanied officer housing	+8,100
Aircraft direct fueling station	+3,700
NAS, North Island, Calif.: Maintenance hangar addition	−5,190
NSB, San Diego, Calif.: Gymnasium	−2,950
PERSPTACT, San Diego, Calif.: Pay and personnel support office	−2,270
NS, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif.: Brig	−17,600
Naval Education and Training Command:	
NAS, Meridian, Miss.:	
Runway service road	[1] +690
Arming and dearming pads	[1] +1,300
Naval Material Command:	
Charleston NSY, Charleston, S.C.:	
Waterfront services support buildings	[1] +1,830
Logistics support facility	[1] +5,800
NPWC, Great Lakes, Ill.: Public works shop	−890
NSB Kings Bay, Ga.: Dredging	−22,000
Portsmouth NSY, Kittery, Maine: Engineering management building	[1] +11,800
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet:	
NS, Keflavik, Iceland:	
Operational trainer facility	−3,160
Squadron support facility	−7,010
Fueling pier	+30,000
NF, Keflavik, Iceland: Terminal equipment building addition	−2,620
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet: NSF, Diego Garcia, I.O.: Lighted navigational range	−495
Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe:	
NAS, Sigonella, Itlay:	
Maintenance hangar	−7,300
Automotive vehicle maintenance shop	−1,340
Land acquisition	−990
Naval Telecommunications Command:	
NAVCAMSWESTPAC, Guam, M.I.: Theater	−1,880
NCS, Nea Makri, Greece: Receiver building	−3,950
Various architectural and engineering services and construction design	−17,000
Subtotal of actions	−36,675
Total military construction authorization	1,744,525
Projects to be accomplished from savings	−27,720

Location and project	*Cost*
Undistributed reduction	−52,280
Total military construction authorized for appropriation	1,664,525

[1] To be funded with savings.

NAVY FAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM

The Navy presented an authorization request for appropriation for the Family Housing program as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request	Committee changes	Revised total
Construction of new family housing (1193 units)	$101,941	−$5,430	$96,511
Post acquisition construction	17,559	0	17,559
Construction improvements	9,000	0	9,000
Planning	8,559	0	8,559
Total authorization for appropriation request, construction	119,500	−5,430	114,070
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses:			
Management accounts	40,237	0	40,237
Services account	29,826	0	29,826
Utilities account	165,523	[1] −400	165,123
Furnishing account	14,263	0	14,263
Miscellaneous account	402	0	402
Total operating expenses	250,251	−400	249,851
Maintenance account:			
Total maintenance account	312,609	[2] −35,000	277,609
Leasing	20,080	0	20,080
Domestic	28	0	28
Foreign	20,052	0	20,052
Debt payment	25,446	0	25,446
Principal	23,286	0	23,286
Interest Payment Family Housing	1,710	0	1,710
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums for existing coverage	450	0	450
Total authorization request O&M and debt payment	608,386	−35,400	572,986
Total authorization for appropriation request, Construction, O&M and debt payment	727,886	−32,830	687,056

[1] Navy offer to reflect adjusted fuel price estimates.

[2] $15,000,000 transferred to construction for new units at MCB Camp Pendleton (Sterling Homes) Calif., $10,000,000 Marine Corps offer and $10,000,000 matching Navy reduction.

The Navy Family Housing program authorization for appropriations request totaled $727,886,000. In addition, $10,425,000 will be applied to the program from anticipated reimbursements.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved the construction or acquisition of 1,193 units of family housing in support of housing at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NS, Adak, Alaska: 405 units	[1] $53,107
MCB, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: 760 units	[2] 41,004

Location and project	*Cost*
AEGIS COMSYSCEN, Wallops Island, Va: 28 units	2,400
Total	104,511

[1] Navy offered reduction from $61,107,000.

[2] Increased from 360 units and $26,004,000 to construct replacements units for Sterling Homes.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
NS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; 100 units	[1]$12,430

[1] Deferred due to budget constraints. Navy to review changing assignment to short tour only.

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Total request	$727,886
NS, Adak, Alaska: 405 units	−8,000
NS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: 100 units	−12,430
MCB, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: 400 units (Sterling Homes)	+15,000
Utilities (adjusted fuel price estimates)	−400
Maintenance (transfer to construction for Sterling Homes)	−15,000
Maintenance (Marine Corps offered reduction and Navy matching reduction)	−20,000
Total, family housing, authorization for appropriation	687,056

PART C—AIR FORCE

The Air Force request for authorization for appropriations in S. 2364 amounted to $3,136,742,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Air Force request, approved the following programs:

	Air Force request	Total authorization	Less amounts not authorized for appropriation	Total authorized for appropriation
Military construction:				
Inside the United States	$1,318,116,000	$1,283,776,000	[1] −$115,600,000	$1,168,166,000
Outside the United States	550,544,000	428,212,000	[2] −35,070,000	393,142,000
Design	163,900,000	143,900,000		143,900,000
Minor construction	21,000,000	21,000,000		21,000,000
Access roads	24,550,000	21,750,000		21,750,000
Total MilCon authorized	2,078,110,000	1,898,628,000	−150,670,000	1,747,958,000
Military family housing:				
Construction, improvements, and design	292,400,000	196,241,000		196,241,000
Support	766,232,000	742,332,000		742,332,000
Total family housing	1,058,632,000	938,573,000		938,573,000
Grand total, Air Force	3,136,742,000	2,837,201,000	−150,670,000	2,686,531,000

[1] Less: A general program reduction of $115,600,000 was for projects to be accomplished from savings.
[2] Less: A reduction of $35,070,000 for GLCM projects to be accomplished with savings.

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Air Force request	Committee approved
Inside the United States (sec. 301):		
Air Force Logistics Command	$145,713	$165,313
Air Force Systems Command	52,870	51,890
Air National Guard	2,960	2,960
Air Training Command	89,505	83,655
Air University	9,980	9,980
Alaska Air Command	50,363	48,963
Military Airlift Command	262,300	235,890
National Military Command Center	4,750	4,750
Pacific Air Forces	3,800	3,800
Space Command	32,400	28,000
Special Project	53,700	53,700
Strategic Air Command	411,325	428,760
Tactical Air Command	174,645	142,605
U.S. Air Force Academy	23,805	23,805
Total inside the United States	1,318,116	1,283,766
Outside the United States (sec. 301):		
Military Airlift Command	9,540	9,540
Pacific Air Forces	187,683	164,853
Space Command	25,000	25,000
Strategic Air Command	13,342	5,550

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Air Force request	Committee approved
Tactical Air Command	43,860	43,860
U.S. Air Forces In Europe	271,119	179,409
Total outside the United States	550,544	428,212
Support (sec. 603):		
Unspecified minor construction	21,000	21,000
Planning and design	163,900	143,900
Access roads	24,550	21,750
Total support	209,450	186,650
Total military construction	2,078,110	1,898,628
Less:		
MILCON:		
General Reduction for Projects to be accomplished with savings		−150,670
Total authorized for appropriation, military construction		1,747,958
Military family housing: Total authorized for appropriation, military family housing	1,058,632	938,573
Grand total Air Force, authorized for appropriation	3,136,742	2,686,531

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Military construction program	Air Force request	Committee approved
Operational	$644,458	$559,448
Training	67,640	68,940
Maintenance/production	208,574	209,357
RDT&E	98,930	97,930
Supply	110,010	93,210
Medical	237,875	265,375
Administrative	109,225	79,420
Personnel housing/community support	269,950	227,340
Personal housing	220,800	190,050
Community support	49,160	37,290
Utilities	88,228	87,638
Air pollution abatement	990	990
Water pollution abatement	3,610	3,610
Energy	29,160	18,720
Minor construction	21,000	21,000
Planning and design	163,900	143,900
Defense access roads	24,500	21,750
Subtotal military construction	2,078,100	1,898,628
Less:		
Reduction for projects to be accomplished with savings		−150,670
Total military construction program	2,078,110	1,747,958
Military family housing	1,058,623	938,573
Total Air Force amount authorized for appropriation	3,136,733	2,686,531

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The mission of the Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) is to provide an adequate and efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance and supply for the U.S. Air Force and train specialized units for accomplishment of logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters.

The committee approved $165,313,000 for 30 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and plan	*Cost*
Hill AFB, Utah:	
Peacekeeper—Maintenance and logistics facilities	$7,730
PKR—Add to and alter X-ray facility	(330)
PKR—Equipment/spares storage	4,700
PKR—Stage IV storage	2,700
Integration support facility	8,000
Aircraft maintenance and training facility	790
Add to and alter aircraft maintenance facility	12,800
Add to and alter flight test facility	2,413
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	7,100
ECIP—Weatherize buildings/alter mechanical system	1,500
Alter electrical distribution system	5,400
Total	45,733
McClellan AFB, Calif.:	
Integrated support facility	[1] 11,200
Education facility	[1] 3,600
Civil engineer facility	[1] 6,300
Technical lab facility	13,091
ECIP-weatherize buildings/alter mechanical	410
Total	34,601
Newark AFS, Ohio: Alter electro—optical lab	840
Robins AFB, Ga.:	
Add to and alter aircraft maintenance docks	7,100
Fire protection—warehouse	1,300
Hazardous materials storage facility	[1] 9,000
Logistic systems operations center	8,390
Emergency back-up power	1,600
Total	27,390
Tinker AFB, Okla.:	
Add to apron	4,150
Petroleum operations facility	1,250
Blade repair facility	11,000
Add to and alter integration support facility	9,829
Clothing sales store	570
Total	26,799
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio:	
Add to and alter engine test cell	3,700
Add to and alter biodynamics laboratory	2,150
Materials lab-metals/ceramics	18,200
Fire protection-propulsion lab	3,050
Add to and alter computer center	2,550
ECIP-weatherize buildings/alter mechanical system	300
Total	29,950

[1] These projects are authorized but are to be funded from savings from current and prior year programs. Added by the committee.

The committee reduced the following projects by the amount shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Hill AFB, Utah:	
Integration support facility	[1] $400
Add to and alter flight test facility	[1] 400
Alter electrical distribution system	[1] 1,300
Tinker AFB, Okla.: Add to and alter integration support facility	[1] 400
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio: Materials lab-metals/ceramics	[1] 1,000

[1] Repricing reduction.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Hill AFB, Utah: Industrial area security support	[1] $1,600
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio: Add to Air Force Museum	[2] 5,400

[1] DOD revision.
[2] Use nonappropriated funds.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The mission of the Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) is to advance aerospace technology, adapt it into operational aerospace systems, and acquire quantitatively superior aerospace systems and material needed to accomplish the Air Force mission.

The committee approved $51,890,000 for 23 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.:	
Heavy equipment shop	$600
Alter transonic wind tunnel	5,000
ECIP-alter mechanical system	2,100
Total	7,700
Brooks AFB, Tex.:	
Add to and alter academic facility	500
Directed energy laboratory	1,550
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,000
Dining hall	1,400
Total	4,450
Cape Canaveral AFS, Fla.: STS-security improvements	2,750
Edwards AFB, Calif.:	
Hydrant fuel system	4,050
System engineering test facility	2,000
Add to and alter science and engineering center	4,750
Education center	800
Avionics shop	1,400
Add to and alter electrical distribution system	2,700
Water pollution—upgrade sewage treatment	1,500
Total	17,200
Eglin AFB, Fla.:	
Add to and alter field training facility	1,150
Munitions maintenance and assembly facility	610
Add to and alter central control facility	920
Total	2,680
Various locations, Fla.: Eastern test range reconfiguration/land acquisition	6,300
Goddard Space Flight Center, Md.: STS-classified data processing facility	3,500

Location and project	*Cost*
Hanscom AFB, Mass.: Alter lab for fire protection	5,200
Patrick AFB, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance unit facility	910
Various locations, ZI: Real Estate for GWEN Facilities	1,200

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Edwards AFB, Calif.: Add to and alter headquarters Center Command Post	[1] $980

[1] Offset for Ellsworth AFB adds.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Federal mission of the Air National Guard is to provide units with trained personnel and sufficient and suitable equipment, capable and ready for mobilization in time of war or national emergency to support the Air Force.

The committee approved $2,960,000 for two projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Base 10-class location, ZI: Add to technical building	$2,150
Otis ANGB, Mass: Pave Paws boundary security system	810

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of the Air Training Command (ATC) is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating, aircrew training, basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty, basic military training, mobile training, and other training as may be directed by the U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff.

The committee approved $83,655,000 for 18 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Chanute AFB, Ill.:	
Fire protection training complex	$7,500
Alter electrical distribution system	2,650
Total	10,150
Goodfellow AFB, Tex.:	
Pave paws support building	7,600
Combat intelligence training center	7,600
Total	15,200
Keesler AFB, Miss.:	
Multipurpose aircraft maintenance shops	3,100
Electrical distribution system	[1]3,000
Air condition composite medical facility kitchen	435
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	9,500
ECIP—insulate building/alter mechanical system	520
Total	16,555
Lackland AFB, Tex.:	
Vehicle maintenance complex	1,850

Location and project	*Cost*
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	7,440
Total	9,290
Laughlin AFB, Tex.: Flight training/academic classroom	6,900
Lowry AFB, Colo.: ECIP—weatherize buildings/alter mechanical and lighting	1,320
Mather AFB, Calif.: Alter electrical substation/distribution system	3,500
Randolph AFB, Tex.: Add to and alter AF military personnel center facility	7,040
Reese AFB, Tex.: Base civil engineer maintenance complex	4,900
Sheppard AFB, Tex.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,300
Williams AFB, Tex.: Petroleum operation complex	2,500

[1] Due to the age and condition of existing electrical systems at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss., the committee recommends funding of $3 million to proceed with phase III, part II to alter the electrical distribution system. The project is authorized, but must be accomplished using savings from current and prior year programs. Added by the committee.

The committee reduced the following projects by the amount shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Chanute AFB, Ill.: Fire protection training complex	[1]$1,200
Goodfellow AFB, Tex.: Combat intelligence training center	[1]400
Laughlin AFB, Tex.: Flight training/academic classroom	[1]500

[1] Repricing reduction.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Goodfellow AFB, Tex.: ECIP-EMCS	[1]$1,550
Lowry AFB, Colo.: Cold storage facility	[1]2,500
Randolph AFB, Tex.: Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	[1]2,700

[1] DOD revision.

AIR UNIVERSITY

The Air University (AU) is the center for Air Force professional military education. It also provides support for the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) and the Air Force Data Systems Design Center.

The committee approved $9,980,000 for two projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and plan	*Cost*
Gunter AFS, Ala.: Computer facility	$9,500
Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Add to and alter composite medical facility	480

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command (AAC) provides combat ready forces, defense weapons systems, aircraft control and warning elements, and air defense forces within Alaska for employment under the operational control of the commander, Alaskan NORAD/CONAD region. It also provides logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Airlift Command, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier and the United States Army.

The committee approved $48,963,000 for 12 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Burnt Mountain AFS, Alaska: Seismic operation and power data transmit facility	$1,400
Eielson AFB, Alaska:	
Repair and reclamation hangar	3,150
Engine shop	3,250
Corrosion control hangar	8,500
Avionics shop	4,400
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,550
ECIP—weatherize building/replace lighting system	1,600
Total	24,450
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska:	
Add to satellite communications	1,900
Aircraft support equipment maintenance shop/storage facility	1,850
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,400
Add to natural gas line	2,163
Total	11,313
Galena Airport, Alaska: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	11,800

The committee reduced the following projects by the amount shown:

Location and project	*Cost*
Eielson AFB, Alaska: ECIP-weatherize building/replace lighting system	[1] $400
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska: Add to satellite communications	[1] 1,000

[1] Repricing reduction.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) is to maintain the military airlift system in the constant state of readiness necessary for performance of all airlift task and emergency operations assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System and Military Airlift.

The committe approved $235,890,000 for 25 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and plan	*Cost*
Charleston AFB, S.C.:	
Alter aircraft general purpose shop	$340
Clinic/dental clinic	8,200
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing—phase I	6,300
Total	14,840
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Fla.:	
Add to and alter tactical force management facility	1,200
ECIP—install heat recovery systems	220
Water tank	660
Total	2,080
Kirtland AFB, N. Mex.: Add to and alter fire sprinkler/alarm system	1,500
Little Rock AFB, Ark.:	
Material handling equipment maintenance shop	1,100

Location and plan	*Cost*
Alter air-condition—composite medical facility	490
Total	1,590
McChord AFB, Wash.:	
Base ammunitions maintenance shop	430
Missile storage facility	400
Vehicle operations administrative facility	440
Add to and alter child care center	1,250
ECIP—insulate buildings—alter mechanical systems	670
Total	3,190
McGuire AFB, N.J.: Add to and alter NCO Academy	440
Norton AFB, Calif.:	
Aircraft corrosion control facility	3,100
Flight simulator training facility	1,250
Aircraft support equipment storage facility	1,100
Add to and alter child care center	1,200
Total	6,650
Pope AFB, N.C.: Add to and alter avionics shop	710
Travis AFB, Calif.:	
Aerial refueling part task trainer	1,000
Composite medical facility—phase II	201,200
Add to and alter child care center	1,700
Air pollution—vapor emission control	990
Total	204,890

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Andrews AFB, Md.: ECIP—Expand energy monitoring and control system	[1]$960
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Fla.: Consolidated support center	[1]5,750
Little Rock AFB, Ark.: Family support center	[1]300
Scott AFB, Ill.: AFCC Headquarters facility	[1]19,400

[1] DOD revision.

NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND CENTER

The mission of the National Military Command Center (NMCC) is to provide command and control activities in direct support of the decision making processes of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Command Authorities.

The committee approved $4,750,000 for one project at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Pentagon, Va.: Add to National Military Command Center	$4,750

PACIFIC AIR FORCES (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations. The forces provide administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved $3,800,000 for three projects at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Hickam AFB, Hawaii:	
Add to and alter hangar	$500
Consolidated technical photo and support facility	1,900
Fleet service terminal	1,400
Total	3,800

SPACE COMMAND (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Space Command is to manage and control assigned operational space assets and also serve as the Air Force command responsible for the strategic defense mission area.

The committee approved $28,000,000 for two projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Falcon AFS, Colo.; Mid-CONUS tracking station	$3,000
Peterson AFB, Colo.; Norad and Spacecom headquarters	25,000

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Clear AFS, Alaska: Unaccompanied Enlisted Personnel Housing	[1] $4,400

[1] Offset for Ellsworth AFB add.

SPECIAL PROJECT

The following special project was submitted.

The committee approved $53,700,000 for a special project at an unspecified location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Unspecified location, ZI: Support facilities	$53,700

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) is to organize, train, equip, administer, prepare and maintain a bomber, tanker and missile force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide offensive operations against enemies of the United States.

The committee approved $428,760,000 for 64 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Barksdale AFB, La.:	
Add to and alter alert crew facility	$2,150
Flight simulator training facility	3,500
Air-launched cruise missile support facilities (phase III)	19,500
ALCM—storage igloos	(15,600)
ALCM—support equipment shock	(2,300)
ALCM—miscellaneous support facilities	(1,600)
Environmental medicine facilities	445
ECIP—alter mechanical system	400
Total	25,995
Beale AFB, Calif.:	
Refueling vehicle shop	940

Location and project	*Cost*
Add to and alter avionics shop	1,300
Total	2,240
Blytheville AFB, Ark.: Precision measurement equipment lab	540
Carswell AFB, Tex.:	
Add to and alter alert ready crew facility	2,250
Aircraft general purpose shop	2,350
Add to and alter aircraft corrosion control facility	3,450
Air-launched cruise missle (ALCM) storage igloos	11,000
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,000
Total	24,050
Castle AFB, Calif.: Aircraft corrosion control facility	4,100
Conrad, Mont.: Strategic training range complex site 6 and land acquisition	4,260
Dickinson, N. Dak.: Strategic training range complex site 5 and land acquisition	3,710
Dyess AFB, Tex.:	
B-1B—beddown support facilities (phase II)	50,000
B-1B—three bay aircraft maintenance hangar	(9,600)
B-1B—hydrant refueling with CASS provisions	(14,500)
B-1B—munitions storage and support facility	(6,800)
B-1B—aircraft corrosion control facility	(3,700)
B-1B—aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	(2,500)
B-1B—add to and alter avionics maintenance shop	(1,700)
B-1B—munitions maintenance facility	(3,500)
B-1B—field maintenance facilities	(1,150)
B-1B—blast deflectors	(750)
B-1B—miscellaneous facilities	(1,100)
B-1B—supporting facilities	(4,700)
Aerial delivery facilities	2,750
Precision measurement equipment laboratory	910
Exterior area lighting	600
Total	54,260
Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak.:	
Security police facility	[1] 4,550
Vehicle maintenance facility	[1] 4,900
B-1B—beddown support facilities (phase II)	45,740
B-1B—add to and alter aircraft maintenance hangars	(20,340)
B-1B—hydrant fuel with CASS provisions	(15,900)
B-1B—add to and alter supply storage facilities	(700)
B-1B—aircraft fuel cell maintenance facilities	(3,200)
B-1B—avionics maintenance shop	(4,600)
B-1B—add to and alter field training facilities	(1,000)
Total	55,190
F. E. Warren AFB, Wyo.:	
Peacekeeper—support facilities/land acquisition	43,970
Peacekeeper—launch facilities site work	(3,200)
Peacekeeper—add to and alter missile maintenance/supply facilities	(2,050)
Peacekeeper—alter communications maintenance facility	(480)
Peacekeeper—alter security control center	(400)
Peacekeeper—heating distribution lines	(5,000)
Peacekeeper—launch facility trainer (silo)	(3,900)
Peacekeeper—maintenance training facility	(3,150)
Peacekeeper—canister processing facility	(2,800)
Peacekeeper—equipment maintenance shop facility	(9,000)
Peacekeeper—missile stage process facility	(5,800)
Peacekeeper—proof load test facility	(510)
Peacekeeper—rail transfer facility	(730)

Location and project	*Cost*
Peacekeeper—special vehicle parking area	(370)
Peacekeeper—stage storage facility	(1,200)
Peacekeeper—stage storage area fence	(350)
Peacekeeper—add to munitions supply inert storage	(800)
Peacekeeper—add to and alter standby power generator facility	(500)
Peacekeeper—entry control facility	(330)
Peacekeeper—reentry system/vehicle storage facility	(1,100)
Peacekeeper—security lighting, fence (WSA)	(1,100)
Peacekeeper—real estate acquisition	(1,200)
Peacekeeper—community impact assistance	[2] (5,940)
Peacekeeper—undistributed reduction	[3] (−5,940)
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,520
Total	49,220
Fairchild AFB, Wash.:	
Backup satellite operations center land acquisition	5,700
Total	5,700
Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak.:	
Add to and alter alert crew facilities	2,300
Total	2,300
Griffiss AFB, N.Y.:	
F-15—beddown and various support facilities	3,400
F-15—add to and alter flight simulator facility	(750)
F-15—missile storage facility	(550)
F-15—missile maintenance facility	(570)
F-15—add to and alter mission support facilities	(950)
F-15—convert to fuel cell maintenance dock	(580)
Total	3,400
Grissom AFB, Ind.:	
Maintenance shop	[4] 1,100
Civil engineering complex	[4] 4,300
Base flight operations facility	920
Total	6,320
K. I. Sawyer AFB, Mich.:	
Aircraft parking	[4] 600
Add to and alter alert crew facility	2,350
ALCM igloo	[4] 2,500
ALCM support facilities	12,000
Total	17,450
Loring AFB, Maine:	
Composite maintenance complex	3,300
Composite medical facility	24,900
Dining hall	3,170
Total	31,370
March AFB, Calif.:	
Flight simulator training facility	3,500
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,650
Total	9,150
Minot AFB, N. Dak.:	
F-15—beddown support facilities	3,700
F-15—helicopter rescue and recovery hangar	(2,400)
F-15—supply and equipment warehouse	(1,300)
Add to and alter alert crew facility	2,600

Location and project	*Cost*
Composite medical facility	[5] 27,500
Total	33,800
Offutt AFB, Neb.:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[4] 5,400
Add to global weather central facility	3,400
Aircraft maintenance facilities (phase III)	34,200
Precision measurement equipment laboratory	900
Add to and alter central powerplant	2,200
Upgrade chilled water plant	5,000
Total	51,100
Pease AFB, N.H.:	
Add to and alter composite medical facility	850
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,100
Total	5,950
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y.:	
Sound suppressor support	750
Total	750
Vandenberg AFB, Calif.:	
Peacekeeper—Add to and alter secure facility	500
Fire station	1,350
STS—security improvements	4,700
STS—launch support facilities	3,650
STS—safety improvements	1,250
STS—thermal protection system	510
STS—south base powerplant	15,950
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,000
Total	33,910
Whiteman AFB, Mo.:	
Cold storage facility	470
Total	470
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich.:	
ALCM igloo	[4] 2,500
Aircraft parking	[4] 600
Environmental medicine facility	425
Total	3,525

[1] Air Force requested projects be added, costs offset by other recommended reductions.

[2] Late requirement to support MX requested by DOD.

[3] Provides offset for MX impact funds.

[4] These projects are authorized but are to be funded from savings from current and prior year programs. Added by the committee.

[5] Added by the committee.

The committee reduced the following projects by the amounts shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Barksdale AFB, La.: ALCM-storage igloos	[1] $1,000
Beale AFB, Calif.: Add to and alter avionics shop	[1] 435
Carswell AFB, Tex.: ALCM-storage igloos	[1] 600
Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak.: Add to and alter alert crew facilities	[1] 500
K.I. Sawyer AFB, Mich.: ALCM support facilities	[1] 2,000
Vandenberg AFB, Calif.: Fire station	[1] 1,000

[1] Repricing reduction.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Blytheville AFB, Ark.: ECIP-EMCS	[1] $2,100
Dyess AFB, Tex.: Military personnel support center	[1] 4,350
Fairchild AFB, Wash.: Enlisted housing	[3] 5,800
Grand Forks AFB, ND: Small arms range	[3] 1,300
Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak.: Family support center	[1] 320
Malmstrom AFB, Mont.: Gymnasium	1,500
Minot AFB, ND:	
Enlisted housing	[3] 4,350
Gymnasium	[3] 560
Minot AFB, N. Dak.: ECIP-EMCS	[1] 1,850
Offutt AFB, Nebr.: Central security control facility	[2] 1,400
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y.: Alter enlisted housing	[3] 2,900
Whiteman AFB, Mo.:	
Missile operations facility	[3] 2,200
Recreation center	[3] 1,650
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich.: Library	[2] 700

[1] DOD revision.

[2] Offset for Ellsworth AFB adds.

[3] Deferred, low priority.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND (INSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Tactical Air Command (TAC) is to organize, equip, train, administer and operate the assigned or attached forces and participate in prompt and substantial tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved $142,605,000 for 62 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Bergstrom AFB, Tex.:	
Add to and alter composite medical facility	$450
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,300
Add to and alter gymnasium	3,050
Total	9,800
Cannon AFB, N. Mex.:	
Weapons maintenance facility	[1] 1,700
PMEL-NDI shop	1,100
Total	2,800
Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.:	
Base civil engineer maintenance facility	2,400
Supply warehouse	3,150
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,300
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	1,550
Total	12,400
England AFB, La.:	
Aircraft squadron parts store	950
ECIP—alter lighting/mechanical systems	1,200
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	800
Total	2,950
George AFB, Calif.:	
Sound suppressor support	550
Munitions facilities	2,150
Base support center	6,300
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	7,100

Location and project	*Cost*
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	1,350
Total	17,450
Holloman AFB, N. Mex.:	
Boles Well	[1]3,200
Security police operations facility	1,300
Base support center	6,100
ECIP—alter lighting-mechanical systems	360
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	650
Total	11,610
Homestead AFB, Fla.: Add to and alter fire stations	1,050
Langley AFB, Va.:	
Anti-satellite system facilities (ASAT)	16,500
ASAT—integrated maintenance facilities	(9,800)
ASAT—missile and motor storage facilities	([illegible]370)
ASAT—administrative building	(645)
ASAT—hydrazine storage	(370)
ASAT—control center	(860)
ASAT—cryogenic storage and processing facility	(955)
Base supply complex—phase II	2,200
Add to and alter various administrative facilities	4,300
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,450
ECIP—install radiant heaters	640
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	1,440
Total	28,530
Luke AFB, Ariz.:	
Avionics shop	2,450
Alter base support center	4,500
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,400
ECIP—install radiant heaters	210
Water wells and water storage tank	2,100
Total	13,660
MacDill AFB, Fla.:	
Satellite communications ground terminal	2,600
Tactical training range (Avon Park)	1,500
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	510
Total	4,610
Moody AFB, Ga.:	
Winnersville range complex	830
Aircraft general squadron parts store	1,200
Total	2,030
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho.:	
Sound suppressor support	550
Add to and alter aircraft general squadron parts store	940
Total	1,490
Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C.:	
Add to and alter telecommunications center	340
Tactical control flight facility	1,700
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	755
Total	2,795
Nellis AFB Nev.:	
PLSS ground support facilities	2,800

Location and project	*Cost*
ECIP—weatherize building/alter mechanical system	990
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	1,300
Total	5,090
Seymour-Johnson AFB, N.C.:	
Add to an alter squad Ops/Pave TAC facility	560
Aircraft maintenance dock	5,650
Add to and alter gymnasium	1,000
ECIP—install radiant heaters	680
Water pollution—upgrade regional connection	1,600
KC-10—beddown support facilities	11,000
KC-10—aircraft park apron/hydrant refuel and CASS provision	(9,160)
KC-10—add to and alter flight simulator training facility	(780)
KC-10—squadron flight operations facility	(780)
KC-10—add to aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	(280)
Total	20,490
Shaw AFB, S.C.:	
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,250
Add to and alter gymnasium	2,100
Refuel vehicle parking and POL facility	620
Total	4,970
Tyndall AFB, Fla.:	
Arm/disarm pad	330
Sound suppressor support	550
Total	880

[1] These projects are authorized but are to be funded from savings from current and prior year programs. Added by the committee.

The committee reduced the following projects by the amounts shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
England AFB, La.: Aircraft maintenance area lighting	[1]$600
Holloman AFB, N. Mex.: Security police operations facility	[1]400
Homestead AFB, Fla.: Add to and alter fire stations	[1]400
Langley AFB, Va.: Base supply complex—phase II	[1]500
MacDill AFB, Fla.: Satellite communications ground term	[1]1,000

[1] Repricing reduction.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Bergstrom AFB, Tex.: ECIP—alter lighting/mechanical system	[1]$1,100
England AFB, La.: BCE administrative facility	[1]1,700
George AFB, Calif.: ECIP—install radiant heaters	[1]480
Homestead AFB, Fla.: Visiting officer quarters	[1]1,500
MacDill AFB, Fla.: Add to and alter recreation library	[1]510
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho: OTH-B operations/software support building	[1]18,000
Nellis AFB, Nev.:	
Parallel taxiway/land acquisition	[1]4,800
Add to and alter base access roads	[1]2,800
Relocate main gate/roads	[1]2,500
Tyndall AFB, Fla.: Aircraft general purpose shop	[1]3,450

[1] DOD revision.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The mission of the United States Air Force Academy is to educate and train young men and women to become officers in the U.S. Air Force.

The Committee approved $23,500,000 for three projects at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
USAF Academy, Colo.:	
Add to and alter cadet gymnasium	$10,000
Add to and alter cadet dining hall	13,100
Add to and alter child care center	400
Total	23,500

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
USAF Academy, Colo.: Add to and alter base civil engineering facility	[1] $305

[1] DOD revision.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Military Airlift Command (MAC) is to maintain the military airlift system in the constant state of readiness necessary for performance of all airlift tasks and emergency operations assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System, and Military Airlift.

The committee approved $9,540,000 for six projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Lajes AB, PO:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	$2,650
Gymnasium	1,900
Total	4,550
Rhein-Main AB, Germany:	
Combat control team facility	790
Add to and alter aerospace ground equipment maintenance shop	950
Recreational library	1,200
Total	2,940
Sidi Slimane, Morroco: Airfield improvements	2,050

PACIFIC AIR FORCES (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Pacific Air Forces is to conduct, control and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations. The forces provide administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved $164,853,000 for 38 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Base 11, classified location OS: Add to and alter technical building	$6,100
Base 14, classified location OS: Add to and alter satellite communications ground term	1,700
Clark AB, Republic of Philippines:	
Assault landing strip	3,300
Aerial delivery facility	4,200
Add to and alter air passenger terminal	4,200
Essential maintenance facilities—phase I	6,100
Sound suppressor support	900
Base hazardous storage	590
Forward supply location facility	900
Traffic management office	3,600
ECIP—alter mechanical/lighting system	3,540
Upgrade powerplant—phase III	14,795
Total	42,125
Diego Garcia AB, Indian Ocean:	
Munitions storage and maintenance	8,500
GEODDS—unaccompanied officer personal housing facilities	7,600
Total	16,100
Kadena AB, Japan:	
Add to and alter hydrant fueling—phase I	6,800
Add to and alter operations building	4,850
Jet fuel storage (JP-4)	6,600
Add to and alter air freight open storage	1,500
Total	19,750
Kimhae AB, Korea: PORTOMOD support	253
Kunsan AB, Korea:	
Consolidated wing headquarters/operations facility	6,200
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,400
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	2,000
Total	11,600
Kwang-Ju AB, Korea:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,500
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	910
Total	4,460
Misawa AB, Japan:	
Commando Port support, phase II (CPII)	18,000
CPII—Upgrade apron pavement	(2,830)
CPII—Aircraft arresting system	(430)
CPII—Aircraft instrument landing and VORTAC system	(630)
CPII—Flight simulator training facility	(1,260)
CPII—Liquid fuel storage facility	(4,400)
CPII—Above ground storage magazines	(710)
CPII—Concrete arch igloo magazines	(7,000)
CPII—Hangar fire alarm/suppression system	(740)
Chiller plant addition	2,000
Total	20,000
Osan AB, Korea:	
KCOIC allied support—Phase I	290
Alter/construct unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	25,200
Alter airmen dining hall	1,100

Location and project	*Cost*
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	3,900
Total	30,490
Sachon AB, Korea: Unaccompanied Enlisted Personnel Housing	1,100
Suwon AB, Korea:	
PORTOMOD support	250
Refueling vehicle maintenance shop	690
Ground fuel storage	3,050
Total	3,990
Taegu AB, Korea:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,300
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	1,650
Total	4,950
Wake Island AFLD, Wake Island: VORTAC facility	1,235
Yokota AB, Japan: ECIP—insulate building/alter lighting system	1,000

The committee reduced the following projects by the amount shown:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Thousands*
Kunsan AB, Korea: Consolidated wing HQ/operations facility	[1]$700
Osan AB, Korea: Alter/construct unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[1]5,200
Suwon AB, Korea: Ground Fuel Storage	[1]100
Taegu AB, Korea:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[1]500
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	[1]500
Yokota AB, Japan: ECIP—Insulate building/alter light system	[1]2,000

[1] Repricing reduction.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Clark AB, Philippines: Add to and alter family support center	[1]$300
Kadena AB, Japan: Aircraft ground equipment storage facility	[2]930
Kimhae AB, Korea: 3d echelon medical contingency complex	[1]12,600

[1] DOD revision.

[2] Offset for Ellsworth AFB add.

SPACE COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Space Command is to manage and control assigned operational space assets and also serve as the Air Force command responsible for the strategic defense mission area.

The committee approved $25,000,000 for two projects at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Thule AB, Greenland:	
Air traffic control tower	$4,000
Power/heat systems upgrade	21,000
Total	25,000

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) is to organize, train, equip, administer, prepare and maintain a bomber, tanker and missile force in a state of readiness capable of conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide offensive operations against enemies of the United States.

The committee approved $5,550,000 for two projects at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Anderson AFB, Guam:	
Flight simulator training facility	$5,200
Aircraft ground equipment shop	350
Total	5,550

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Anderson AFB, Guam:	
Small parts corrosion facility	–$892
Alter enlisted housing	6,900

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

The mission of the Tactical Air Command (TAC) is to organize, equip, train, administer and operate the assigned or attached forces and participate in prompt and substantial tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved $43,860,000 for nine projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Howard AFB, Canal Zone: ECIP—alter lighting system	$360
Various locations, MU:	
USCENTCOM support facilities	42,000
Seeb—dispersal/access pavements	(2,000)
Seeb—hardened aircraft shelters	(13,100)
Seeb—Warehouse (environmentally controlled)	(2,000)
Seeb—Facility accommodation support (FAS)	(9,800)
Thumrait—LOX cart storage	(300)
Thumrait—Facility accommodation support	(13,000)
Thumrait—Transient billets	(1,800)
Total	42,000
Palmerola AB, HO: Forward munitions storage area	1,500

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) is to conduct, control and coordinate offensive and defensive air operations in accordance with tasks assigned by the Commander-in-Chief U.S. European Command. It also fulfills responsibilities assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or U.S. Commander-in-Chief Europe area of responsibilities.

The committee approved $179,409,000 for 62 projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Alconbury, RAF, United Kingdom:	
PLSS support facilities	$3,300
Sound suppressor support	550
Child care center	1,150
Water pollution—add to sewer mains	510
Total	5,510
Alzey radar site, Germany: Tactical air control facility	3,150
Ankara AS, Turkey: Warehouse	1,100
Aviano AB, Italy: Dangerous cargo pad	1,600
Base 13-class location, OS: Satellite communications ground terminal	2,050
Base 19-class location, OS: Satellite communications ground terminal	2,850
Bitburg AB, Germany:	
Aircraft cargo apron	750
Combat arms range	400
Add to and alter aircraft corrosion control facility	500
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,700
Total	4,350
Camp New Amsterdam, Netherlands:	
Vehicle maintenance complex	3,700
2d echelon medical logistics storage facility	360
Airfield security lighting	450
Total	4,510
Chicksands RAF, United Kingdom: Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,550
Classified location, Germany: GLCM-base supply administration	600
Classified location, OS: Auxiliary seismic network	2,100
Comiso AS, Italy:	
Ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) facilities	2,365
GLCM—child care center	(700)
GLCM—American Forces Radio & TV Service	(1,155)
GLCM—clothing sales store	(510)
Total	2,365
Florennes, Belgium:	
Ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) various support facilities	2,060
GLCM—child care center	(770)
GLCM—library	(570)
GLCM—American Forces Radio & TV Service	(720)
Total	2,060
Greenham Common RAF, United Kingdom:	
Ground launched cruise missile (GLCM) various support facilities	1,000
GLCM-recreation library	(600)
GLCM-add to and alter chapel center	(400)
Jet fuel storage	11,000
Total	12,000
Incirlik AB, Turkey:	
Add to and alter air freight terminal	1,000
2d echelon medical logistics storage facility	1,150
Gymnasium	1,600
Total	3,750
Lakenheath RAF, United Kingdom:	
Troop issue warehouse	1,050

Location and project	*Cost*
Flightline roads/parking and fence	1,050
Total	2,100
Mildenhall RAF, United Kingdom:	
Aircraft organizational maintenance shop	800
JP-7 jet fuel storage facility	2,500
Upgrade water distribution system	1,600
Total	4,900
Molesworth RAF, United Kingdom:	
Ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) various support facilities	15,004
GLCM-operations and maintenance training facility	(3,460)
GLCM-unaccompanied enlisted personnel—Alconbury	(4,780)
GLCM-command and control safety measures	(2,644)
GLCM-utilities/pavements	(4,120)
Total	15,004
Ramstein AB, Germany:	
Add to and alter flight simulator facility	1,700
2d echelon medical logistics storage facility	1,750
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,200
Total	8,650
San Vito AS, Italy: Add to and alter operations facility	2,250
Spangdahlem AB, Germany: Refueling vehicle parking	420
Torrejon AB, Spain:	
European distribution system (EDS) forward storage warehouse	1,050
Vehicle maintenance complex	4,700
Warehouse	1,600
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,700
ECIP—alter mechanical system/insulate hot water lines	700
Total	9,750
Upper Heyford RAF, United Kingdom:	
Add to and alter flight simulator facility	1,700
Combat arms range	610
Refueling vehicle maintenance shop	750
Warehouse	2,150
Total	5,210
Various locations, Europe:	
Telecommunications facilities	3,000
Chemical warfare protection	13,400
Total	16,400
Various locations, Germany:	
PLSS ground station	7,800
Minidrone support facilities	6,800
Total	14,600
Welford RAF, United Kingdom: Munitions security lighting	740
Wenigerath AB, Germany: Bomb renovation plant	2,475
Weisbaden AB, Germany: 2d echelon medical logistics storage facility	650
Woensdrecht AB, Netherlands:	
Digital European backbone facility	2,650
Ground launched cruise missile (GLCM), various support facilities	[1] 35,070
GLCM—Utilities, pavements and roads	(8,000)
GLCM—Command and control safety measures	(2,500)
GLCM—Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	(10,400)

Location and project	*Cost*
GLCM—Dining hall	(1,980)
GLCM—Base cold storage	(985)
GLCM—Base supply and administration	(1,280)
GLCM—Base civil engineering maintenance shop	(1,300)
GLCM—Telecommunications facility	(470)
GLCM—Operations and maintenance training facility	(1,970)
GLCM—Communications equipment facility	(720)
GLCM—Fire station	(1,280)
GLCM—High frequency facility	(885)
GLCM—Tower support facility	(295)
GLCM—Vehicle operations complex	(555)
GLCM—Base supply storage	(2,100)
GLCM—Boundary fence and gatehouse	(350)
Total	37,720
Woodbridge RAF, United Kingdom: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,050
Zaragoza AB, Spain: Add to and alter water distribution system	1,100
Zweibrucken AB, Germany:	
Base operation facility	900
Sound suppressor support	570
Add to and alter vehicle maintenance shop	1,350
Child care center	600
Airfield security lighting	425
Total	3,845

[1] To be constructed with savings after U.S. and Netherlands agree on basing.

The committee reduced the following projects by the amount shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Bitburg AB, Germany:	
Aircraft cargo apron	[1] $400
Combat arms range	[1] 200
Add to and alter aircraft corrosion control facility	[1] 210
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[1] 600
Camp New Amsterdam, Netherlands: Vehicle maintenance complex	[1] 800
Spangdahlem AB, Germany: Refueling vehicle parking	[1] 200
Zweibrucken AB, Germany: Base operations facility	[1] 210

[1] Repricing reduction.

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Bitburg AB, Germany: Aircraft battle damage repair facility	[1] $3,150
Classified location, OS: Alternate war headquarters	[2] 7,850
Comiso AS, Italy: GLCM-consolidated open mess	[1] 3,170
Florennes, Belgium: GLCM-consolidated open mess	[1] 2,580
Hahn AB, Germany:	
Aircraft battle damage repair facility	[1] 3,150
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[3] 800
Family support center	[1] 200
Incirlik AB, Turkey:	
Igloos	[1] 3,400
Warehouse	[1] 2,200
Post Office	[1] 430
Mildenhall RAF, United Kingdom: Aircraft parking apron	[1] 9,200
Torrejon AB Spain: 4th echelon medical contingency complex	[1] 3,600
Wenigerath AB, Germany: Munitions security lighting	[3] 590
Wethersfield RAF, United Kingdom: Jet fuel storage	[1] 4,300
Woensdrecht AB, Netherlands:	
Ground Launched Cruise Missile (GLCM) Var Spt Facs	[4] 43,930
GLCM—visiting airmen quarters	(1,550)
GLCM—visiting officer quarters	(1,700)

Location and project	*Thousands*
GLCM—combat training facility	(835)
GLCM—small arms range & storage	(1,190)
GLCM—audiovisual facility	(450)
GLCM—utilities pavements & roads	(8,700)
GLCM—command & control safety measures	(200)
GLCM—group headquarters	(7,100)
GLCM—transportation management facility	(1,515)
GLCM—base civil engineer maintenance shops	(1,475)
GLCM—base civil engineer administrative facility	(175)
GLCM—composite medical facility	(9,200)
GLCM—medical warehouse	(315)
GLCM—unaccompanied officer personnel housing	(3,925)
GLCM—base civil engineer storage	(1,040)
GLCM—base supply storage	(690)
GLCM—boundary fence/gate house	(170)
GLCM—physical training facility	(3,700)

[1] DOD revision.
[2] Seek NATO funding.
[3] Offset for Ellsworth AFB adds.
[4] No agreement by the host nation on stationing.

SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The support portion of the program includes resources for accomplishment of design work on fiscal year 1985, 1986, 1987 and subsequent years' military construction projects, unspecified minor construction for accomplishment of urgent requirements anticipated to arise during fiscal year 1985 and access roads.

The committee approved $186,650,000 for the following elements of the support program:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Various locations, worldwide:	
Unspecified minor construction	$21,000
Planning and design	143,900
Defense access roads	21,750
Total	186,650

The committee reduced the following activity by the amount shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Planning and design	[1] $20,000

[1] Reduced construction effort.

SUMMARY OF AIR FORCE PROGRAM ACTIONS

A summary of actions taken on the request of the Air Force is tabulated by project as follows:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Air Force request	$2,078,110
Air Force Logistics Command:	
Hill AFB, Ut.:	
Integration support facility	−400
Add to and alter flight test facility	−400
Alter electrical distribution system	−1,300
Industrial area security support	−1,600
McClellan AFB, Calif.:	
Integrated support facility	+11,200

Location and project	*Cost*
Education facility	+3,600
Civil engineer facility	+6,300
Robins AFB, Ga.: Hazardous materials storage facility	+9,000
Tinker AFB, Okla.: Add to and alter integrat support facility	−400
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio:	
Materials lab-metals/ceramics	−1,000
Add to Air Force museum	−5,400
Air Force Systems Command:	
Edwards AFB, Calif.:	
Add to and alter Headquarters Center Command post	−980
Air Training Command:	
Chanute AFB, Ill.: Fire protection training complex	−1,200
Goodfellow AFB, Tex.:	
Combat intelligence training center	−400
ECIP-energy monitoring and control system	−1,550
Keesler AFB, Miss.: Electrical distribution system	+3,000
Laughlin AFB, Tex.: Flight training/academic classroom	−500
Lowry AFB, Colo.: Cold storage facility	−2,500
Randolph AFB, Tex.: Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	−2,700
Alaskan Air Command:	
Eielson AFB, Alaska.: ECIP-weatherize bldg/replace lighting system	−400
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska.: Add to satellite communications	−1,000
Military Airlift Command:	
Andrews AFB, Md.: ECIP-expand energy monitor & control system	−960
Eglin auxiliary field 9, Fl.: Consolidated support center	−5,750
Little Rock AFB, Ark.: Family support center	−300
Scott AFB, Ill.: AFCC headquarters facility	−19,400
Space Command:	
Clear AFB, Ak.: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−4,400
Strategic Air Command:	
Barksdale AFB, La.: ALCM-storage igloos	−1,000
Beale AFB, Calif.: Add to and alter avionics shop	−435
Blytheville AFB, Ark.: ECIP-EMCS	−2,100
Carswell AFB, Tex.: ALCM-storage igloos	−600
Dyess AFB, Tex.: Military personnel support center	−4,350
Ellsworth AFB, S.Dak.:	
Security police facility	+4,550
Vehicle maintenance facility	+4,900
Fairchild AFB, Wash.: unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,800
Malmstrom AFB, Mont.: Add to and alter gymnasium	−1,500
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y.: Alter unaccompanied personnel housing	−2,900
Whiteman AFB, Mo.:	
Missile operations facility	−2,200
Recreation center	−1,650
F.E. Warren AFB, Wyo.:	
Peacekeeper-community impact assistance	+5,940
Peacekeeper-Undistributed reduction	−5,940
Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak.:	
Add to and alter crew facilities	−500
Family support center	−320
Small arms range	−1,300
Grissom AFB, Ind.:	
Maintenance shop	+1,100
Civil engineering complex	+4,300
K.I. Sawyer AFB, Mich.:	
Aircraft parking	+600
ALCM igloo	+2,500
ALCM support facilities	−2,000
Minot AFB, N. Dak.:	
ECIP-EMCS	−1,850
Composite medical facility	+27,500
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−4,350
Add to and alter gymnasium	−560
Offutt AFB, Neb.:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	+5,400
Central security control facility	−1,400

Location and project	*Cost*
Vandenberg AFB, Calif.: Fire station	−1,000
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich.:	
ALCM Igloo	+2,500
Aircraft parking	+600
Library	−700
Tactical air command:	
Bergstrom AFB, Tex.: ECIP-alter lighting/mechanical systems	−1,000
Cannon AFB, N.Mex.: Weapons maintenance facility	+1,700
England AFB, La.:	
BCE administration facility	−1,700
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	−600
George AFB, Calif.: ECIP-install radiant heaters	−480
Holloman AFB, N.Mex.:	
Boles well	+3,200
Security police operations facility	−400
Homestead AFB, Fla.:	
Visting officer quarters	−1,500
Add to and alter fire stations	−400
Langley AFB, Va.: Base supply complex-phase II	--500
MacDill AFB, Fla.:	
Add to and alter recreation library	−510
Satellite communications ground terminal	−1,000
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho.: OTH-B operations/software support bldg	−18,000
Nellis AFB, Nev.:	
Parallel taxiway/land acquisition	−4,800
Relocate main gate/roads	−2,500
Tyndall AFB, Fla.: Aircraft general purpose shop	−3,450
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo.: Add to and alter BCE facility	−305
Pacific Air Forces (outside the United States):	
Clark AB, R.P.: Add to and alter family support center	−300
Kadena AB, Japan: Acft ground equipment storage facility	−930
Kimhae AB, Korea: 3rd echelon medical contingency complex	−12,600
Kunsan AB, Korea: Consolidated wing headquarters/operations facility	−700
Osan AB, Korea: Alter/const unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−5,200
Suwon AB, Korea: Ground fuel storage	−100
Taegu AB, Korea:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−500
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	−500
Yokota AB, Japan: ECIP-Insulate bldg/alter lighting system	−2,000
Strategic Air Command: Anderson AFB, Guam:	
Small parts corrosion control facility	−892
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−6,900
U.S. Air Forces in Europe:	
Bitburg AB, Germany:	
Aircraft cargo apron	−400
Combat arms range	−200
Add to and alter aircraft corrosion control facility	−210
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−600
Aircraft battle damage repair facility	−3,150
Camp New Amsterdam, N.L.: Vehicle maintenance complex	−800
Classified location, O/S: Alternate war headquarters	−7,850
Comiso AS, Italy: GLCM-consolidated open mess	−3,710
Florennes, Belgium: GLCM-consolidated open mess	−2,580
Hahn AB, Germany:	
Aircraft battle damage repair facility	−3,150
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	−800
Family support center	−200
Incirlik AB, Turkey:	
Igloos	−3,400
Warehouse	−2,200
Post Office	−430
Mildenhall RAF, United Kingdom: Aircraft parking apron	−9,200
Spangdahlem AB, Germany: Refueling vehicle parking	−200

Location and project	*Cost*
Torrejon AB, Spain: 4th echelon medical contingency complex	−3,600
Wenigerath AB, Germany: Munitions security lighting	−590
Wethersfield RAF, United Kingdom: Jet fuel storage	−4,300
Woensdrecht AB, Netherlands:	
Ground launched cruise missle (GLCM) various support facilities	−43,930
GLCM—visiting airmen quarters	(1,550)
GLCM—visiting officer quarters	(1,700)
GLCM—combat training facility	(835)
GLCM—small arms range and storage	(1,190)
GLCM—audiovisual facility	(450)
GLCM—utilities pavements and roads	(8,700)
GLCM—command and control safety measures	(200)
GLCM—group headquarters	(7,100)
GLCM—transportation management facility	(1,515)
GLCM—base civil engineer maintenance shops	(175)
GLCM—base civil engineer administrative facility	(1,475)
GLCM—composite medical facility	(9,200)
GLCM—medical warehouse	(315)
GLCM—unaccompanied officer personnel housing	(3,925)
GLCM—base civil engineer storage	(1,040)
GLCM—base supply storage	(690)
GLCM—boundary fence/gate house	(170)
GLCM—physical training facility	(3,700)
Zweibrucken AB, Germany: Base operations facility	−210
Support:	
Add to and alter base access roads	−2,800
Planning and design	−20,000
Subtotal of actions	−179,482
Total, military construction for authorization	1,898,628
Projects to be accomplished from savings	−150,670
Total, military construction authorization for appropriation	1,747,958

AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING

The goal of the Air Force Family Housing Account under this Act is to provide adequate, well maintained family quarters for all 350,000 family members either in government owned and leased buildings, or in the adjacent private community through the use of housing referral services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing	224,227	148,068
Post acquisition	62,173	42,173
Planning and design	6,000	6,000
Total construction	292,400	196,241
Support—Operations and maintenance:		
Operations	327,558	327,558
Maintenance	351,455	331,455
Subtotal O&M	679,013	659,013
Leasing	57,239	53,339
Debt payment	29,980	29,980
Total support	766,232	742,332
Total FH authorization	1,058,632	938,573

FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION

Family housing new construction is intended to reduce the housing deficit where the private community does not provide sufficient adequate housing to support the Air Force mission. The Committee approved $148,068,000 for seven projects (1,671 units) at the following locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Number of units	Cost
Fort McArthur, Calif	140	$16,500
Hanscom AFB, Miss (mobile home park)		500
Conrad AFS, Mont	40	3,705
F.E. Warren AFB, Wyo	265	17,343
Florennes, Belgium	400	37,509
Comiso, Italy	576	50,070
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom	250	22,441
Total	1,671	148,068

The committee did not authorize the following projects due to budget constraint:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Number of units	Cost
Osan AB, Korea (utilities expansion)		$2,700
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom	300	27,410
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom	200	21,963
Classified Location, Germany	250	24,086

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $42,173,000 for 89 spaces improvements projects at various locations including 3 projects where the per unit cost for improvement and repair exceed the statutory limitation ($30,000 times the area cost factor). The committee deferred $20,000,000 in housing improvements due to budget constraints. Energy conservation programs were not deferred.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved $6,000,000 for planning and design for fiscal year 1985 and future year construction projects, new and post acquisition.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved $659,013,000 for the operation and maintenance of family housing units. The maintenance request was reduced $20,000,000 due to general budget constraints.

LEASING

The committee approved $53,339,000 for 7,689 foreign leases, 6 of which may exceed the statutory limit of $1,400 per month. The request was reduced $3,900,000 due to budget constraints.

DEBT PAYMENT

The committee approved $29,980,000 for principal and interest payment on mortgaged Capehart and Wherry housing units and Serviceman's Mortgage Insurance premiums.

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

	Thousands
Total request	$1,058,632
Osan AB Korea, new construction	−2,700
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, new construction	−27,410
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, new construction	−21,963
Classified Location, Germany, new construction	−24,086
Unspecified location:	
Improvements	−20,000
Maintenance	−20,000
Leasing	−3,900
Subtotal of actions	−120,059
Total family housing authorization	938,573

PART D—DEFENSE AGENCIES

The administration requested authorization of $479,300,000. The committee approved $358,245,000 for the following programs.

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Defense agencies request	Total authorization	Less amounts not authorized for appropriation	Total authorized for appropriation
Military construction:				
Inside the United States	$233,425	$210,703	$50,000	$158,203
Outside the United States	177,075	141,242	52,500	141,242
Planning and design	30,000	30,000		30,000
Unspecified minor construction	4,000	4,000		4,000
Secretary of Defense contingency	15,000	5,000		5,000
Total MILCON authorized	459,500	390,945	52,500	338,445
Military family housing:				
Construction, improvements, and design	800	800		800
Support	19,000	19,000		19,000
Total family housing	19,800	19,800		19,800
Grand total, Defense agencies	479,300	410,745	52,500	358,245

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM

The Secretary of Defense's military construction request for the Defense Agencies totaled $479,300,000 for fiscal year 1985. Included in this total are: $410,500,000 for major construction of new facilities and rehabilitation of existing facilities at 30 locations within the United States and at 41 locations overseas; $15 million for contingency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense to provide for unforseen construction requirements in emergency situations; $30,000,000 for planning and design; $4,000,000 for unspecified minor construction projects, $800,000 for family housing construction and improvements; and $19,000,000 for family housing support.

The committee gave careful consideration to all projects and related support. The following table summarizes the authorization requested and approved:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal Year 1985 request	Committee approved
Defense Investigative Service	$220	$220
Defense Logistics Agency	71,600	74,100
Defense Mapping Agency	20,100	20,100
Defense Nuclear Agency	1,000	1,000
National Security Agency	48,000	27,800
Secretary of Defense Activities	269,580	228,725
Department of Defense Dependents Schools	(185,883)	(150,050)
Overseas	(132,500)	(96,667)
Section 6	(53,383)	(53,383)
Classified activities	(47,200)	(47,200)
Defense Foreign Language Institute	(22,475)	(22,475)
High energy laser systems test facility	(9,000)	(9,000)
National Defense University	(5,022)	0
OSD contingency construction	15,000	5,000
Unspecified minor constructon	4,000	4,000
Planning and design	30,000	30,000
Family housing	19,800	19,800
New construction and improvements	(800)	(800)
Support	(19,000)	(19,000)
General reduction for inflation		−52,500
Total	479,300	358,245

DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE

The missions of the Defense Investigative Service are the personnel security investigative program and the industrial security program for the Department of Defense.

The committee approved $220,000 for one project at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Fort Holabird, Md.: Storage facility	$220

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Logistics Agency is to provide services and supplies used in common by all of the Military Services. The Agency provides support in the areas of supply, contract administration, technical services, and property disposal to the Military Services, Federal Agencies and certain foreign governments.

The committee approved 12 projects at the following 12 locations including an added Hazardous Material Waste Facility project at Robins Air Force Base, Georgia:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Defense fuel support point, Adak, Alaska: Fuel tankage	$6,730
Defense fuel support point, Whittier, Alaska: Fuel tankage	12,170
Defense Property Disposal Office, Fairbanks, Alaska: Covered storage	1,800
Defense Property Disposal Office, San Diego, Calif.: Hazardous material waste facility	900
Robins Air Force Base, Ga.: Hazardous material waste facility	[1] 2,500
Defense Property Disposal Office, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Hawaii: Hazardous material waste facility	1,950
Defense fuel support point, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Fire protection	475

Location and project	*Cost*
Defense fuel support point, Cincinnati, Ohio: Replace fuel pier	2,600
Defense depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.: Integrated material handling complex	18,000
Defense fuel support point, Mukilteo, Wash.: Fire protection	500
Defense fuel support point, Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, San Juan, P.R.: Fuel tankage	10,675
Defense fuel support point, Pohang, Korea: Fuel tankage	15,800

[1] Project to be accomplished with prior-year savings.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Mapping Agency is to acquire or develop and to supply maps, charts, and other geodetic information required by the Department of Defense.

The committee approved $20,100,000 for one project at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
DMA Hydrographic Topographic Center, Brookmont, Md; Addition to Abert Hall	$20,100

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

The Defense Nuclear Agency conducts nuclear weapons effects research and advises the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on nuclear weapons matters.

The committee approved one project at the following location:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Fort McClellan, Ala.: Test site operations building	$1,000

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The mission of the National Security Agency is to organize, and manage activities and facilities for the production of foreign intelligence information.

The committee approved nine projects at the following locations:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Fort George G. Meade, Md.:	
Systems Processing Center	$12,585
Support Activities Bldg 3	4,680
Mod. Single Enlisted Quarters	3,800
AWCS Support/Admin. Bldg	410
Electric Vault Venting	125
Rosman, N.C.: Electric Substation	500
CONUS classified: Electric Substation	500
Overseas: Classified:	
Fire Protection System	700
POWDERBLUE	4,500

The Committee did not approve the following projects:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Baltimore, Md.: Acquisition and Modification of Appraiser's Store	[1] $7,500
Fort George G. Meade, Md: Energy Retrofit Ops. Bldg. 1	12,700

[1] Committee disagrees with policy requiring DoD to pay for excess Federal property.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The committee approved $228,725,000 for various activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense including three classified projects, 35 projects for overseas dependent schools, 12 projects for Section 6 (CONUS) schools, and facilities to support the Defense Language Institute, and a High Energy Laser System Test Facility.

The committee notes that this is the first year in which Section 6 school requirements have been included in a military construction program since the Department of Defense was authorized to construct such facilities. The Committee supports the need for adequate schools for children living on military installations and has approved the 12 projects requested for that purpose. (See Areas of Special Emphasis for further comments.)

The committee approved the following projects at the revised costs indicated based on revised cost indices:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Office of Dependent Schools:	
Amberg, Germany: Elementary school addition	$1,610
Bad Kreuznach, Germany:	
Elementary school addition	1,020
High school addition	2,150
Bad Nauheim: Elementary school addition	1,040
Bindlach, Germany: Elementary school addition	1,510
Crailsheim, Germany: Elementary school addition	1,430
Frankfort, Germany:	
Elementary school 3 (Edwards)	5,800
High school addition	4,220
Goeppingen, Germany: Elementary/junior high school addition	1,790
Hahn Air Base Germany: Elementary school addition	2,450
Ludwigsburg, Germany: High school addition	1,830
Katterbach, Germany: Elementary school	3,260
Mannheim, Germany: Elementary school addition	3,260
Neubruecke, Germany: Elementary school	2,330
Osterholz-Scharmbeck, Germany: Elementary school addition	820
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany: Elementary school addition	1,830
Ulm, Germany: Elementary/high school addition	2,560
Wertheim, Germany: Elementary school addition	1,800
Worms, Germany: Elementary school addition	1,930
Wuerzburg, Germany: High school addition	2,297
Wiesbaden, Germany: Elementary school addition	720
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland: Elementary/high school addition	2,890
Comiso, Italy: Elementary/high school addition	11,290
Camp McTureous, Japan: Elementary school	5,220
Zukeran, Japan: Elementary school addition	2,250
Seoul, Korea: High school addition	1,130
Brunssum, The Netherlands: High school addition	2,440
Clark Air Force Base, Republic of the Philippines: Elementary school addition	4,970
Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines:	
Elementary school addition (Binictican)	880
High school addition (George Dewey)	1.040
Elementary school addition (Kalayaan)	1,030
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom: Elementary and high school	10,410
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom: Elementary school addition	810
RAF High Wycombe, United Kingdom: High school (London Central)	5,270
RAF Woodbridge United Kingdom: High school addition	1,380
Subtotal overseas schools	96,667

The committee did not approve the following overseas dependents school projects:

[Dollar in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Florennes, Belgium: Elementary/high school	[1] $10,100
Germersheim, Germany, Elementary school	[1] 1,680
Camp Kinser, Japan: Elementary school	[1] 5,410

[1] DoD offered this reduction.

The committee approved the following school projects subject to the provisions of section 283.

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
Department of Defense Section 6 (CONUS) Schools:	
Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Elementary school addition	$1,700
Fort Benning, Ga.: New middle school	5,600
Fort Campbell, Ky.:	
Three elementary school additions	2,700
Renovation of six schools	4,800
Fort Knox, Ky.:	
Vocational education center	3,450
Air-condition nine schools	7,200
Library media center	4,311
Intramural facility	2,000
Auditorium and 14 classrooms	5,000
U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.: Elementary school, addition to and alteration	3,650
Fort Bragg, N.C.: Renovation of five elementary schools	5,600
Fort Jackson, S.C.: New elementary school	7,372
Subtotal section 6 schools	53,383
Classified activities:	
Classified activity, Fort Belvoir, Va.: Operations building addition	28,400
Classified location, CONUS: Classified project	5,900
Overseas classified, Computer facility, Primary power upgrade	12,900
Subtotal classified activities	47,200
Training activities:	
Defense Foreign Language Institute, Monterey, Calif.:	
Dining facility	2,225
Physical fitness center	9,800
Library	1,680
Child care center	2,030
Recreation center	2,410
Logistics support facility	2,930
Company administration and supply	1,400
Subtotal DFLI	22,475
High energy laser system test facility, White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.: High energy laser test facility	9,000

The committee also did not approve the following project because it does not agree with the policy requiring DOD to pay for excess Federal property:

[Dollars in thousands]

Location and project	*Cost*
National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, DC.: Land Acquisition	$5,022

CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $5,000,000 of the $15,000,000 requested in new authorization for unforeseen contingency construction requirements. The committee feels this amount is adequate in view of the present $18.7 million balance in this account.

UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $4,000,000 for unspecified minor construction projects authorized under Title 10 USC 2805. This is considered adequate to enable the numerous Defense Agencies and activities to react to requirements resulting from unforeseen situations which could affect mission performance or safety of life or property, and to take advantage of opportunities to attain greater efficiency of operations.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved the $30,000,000 requested for planning and design to support the timely design of Defense Agency projects proposed for inclusion in outyear programs.

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

The committee increased the authorization provided in Section 604(a) of Public Law 98-115 by $28.3 million to permit full use of appropriations approved for fiscal year 1984 Defense Agencies Military Construction projects.

FAMILY HOUSING

The committee approved the $19,800,000 requested for Military Family Housing to support the Defense Agencies. The details of this amount are as follows:

FAMILY HOUSING—DEFENSE AGENCIES

[Dollars in thousands]

	Defense Mapping Agency	Defense Intelligence Agency	National Security Agency	Defense Logistics Agency	Total
New construction			$693		$693
Improvements			70	$37	107
Subtotal			763	37	800
Operation	$22	$1,917	533	169	2,641
Leasing	31	9,654	6,088		15,773
Maintenance	25		305	256	586
Subtotal	78	11,571	6,026	425	19,000
Total	78	11,571	7,689	462	19,800

SUMMARY OF DEFENSE AGENCIES PROGRAM CHANGES

	Thousands
Total Defense Agency authorization request	$479,300
Military construction:	
Total Defense Agency authorization request	459,500
Committee reductions:	
National Security Agency Appraiser's Stores, Baltimore, Md	−7,500
National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. land acquisition	−5,022
DOD dependents schools:	
Florennes Belgium: Elementary/high school	−10,100
Germersheim, Germany: Elementary school	−1,680
Camp Kinser, Japan: Elementary school	−5,410
Reduction for revised cost indices	−18,643
OSD:	
Secretary of Defense contingency construction	−10,000
General reduction for savings	−52,500
Total reductions	−110,855
Committee additions:	
Defense Logistics Agency—Defense Property Disposal Office Robins AFB, Ga., Hazardous Material Waste Facility	[1] +2,500
Total additions	[1] +2,500
New military construction authorization	351,145
Family housing: Total Defense Agency authorization request	19,800
New family housing authorization	19,800
New Defense Agency military construction and family housing authorization	370,945

[1] Project to be accomplished with savings.

PART E—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

NATO AUTHORIZATION

The Secretary of Defense requested $296,700,000 under this part for the U.S. contribution to the NATO common-funded Infrastructure program in fiscal year 1985. The committee is very supportive of the NATO Infrastructure program and believes that the majority of construction requirements for Europe should be funded by this program. It is essential to the United States that NATO fund high priority facility construction requirements in Europe to the maximum extent. The committee recalls that the requirement for NATO for fiscal year 1984 was $300 million but only $150 million was requested because the United States was able to use funds authorized in prior years. This surplus occurred partly because of the strength of the dollar against foreign currencies. The committee believes that the present strength of the dollar will continue through 1984 and there will again be surplus funds available in 1985. Therefore, the committee has agreed to reduce the authorization of appropriation to $131,700,000 for fiscal year 1985 as recommended by the Defense Department.

PART F—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The authorization of appropriations and administrative provisions contained in Part F are designed to provide certain restrictions as well as relief in execution of the authorization contained in the act. With relatively few exceptions they are essentially the same as those recurring provisions contained in past military construction authorization acts.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 251 through 225 contains language which appears in each annual military construction Act except the dollar amounts now include the amounts of authorizations contained in the other parts of this title.

ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Section 256 defines the activities included in sections 251 through 254 for military family housing. Construction and acquisition includes amounts for minor construction, improvements to existing military family housing units and facilities, relocation of military family housing units under Section 2827 of the 10, United States Code, and architectural and engineering services and construction design. Support includes amounts for operating expenses, leasing expenses, maintenance of real property expenses, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, and payments of mortgage insurance authorized under Section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m).

EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS: EXTENSIONS OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATION

Section 257 is similar to the repeal provision in last year's act and continues in effect their previously established policy of repealing military construction authorizations that have not been used within a specified period after enactment. This section also exempts the following projects from repeal:

> Four Army fiscal year 1983 projects at Vilseck, Germany for which funds cannot be obligated until the Federal Republic of Germany agrees to substantially share the cost of the restationing plan. Agreement is not expected by October 1984 when authorization expires for these projects.

An Army fiscal year 1983 consolidated heating facility at Giessen, Germany which may not be awarded by October 1984. This project is being redesigned because of a high current working estimate and the requirement to meet Productivity Investment Fund criteria. The project is scheduled for award in September 1984.

A Navy fiscal year 1983 project for a standby generator plant in Hawaii March 1983. The low bidder had been suspended from bidding and a court order has been issued which prevents contract award. A court ruling is not expected prior to October 1984.

An Air Force project for construction at Ras Banas, Egypt which is held in abeyance pending availability of funds for the U.S. share of this jointly funded facility. A fiscal year 1984 Supplemental appropriations request has been submitted and is expected to be approved for this work but contract award may not occur prior to October 1, 1984.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW

Section 258 continues the procedure of establishing certain thresholds for the forthcoming Military Construction program. The table below compares the amounts specified by law for fiscal year 1984 to those approved by the committee for fiscal year 1985:

	Fiscal year—	
	1984	1985
Maximum amount for unspecified minor construction	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Amount for reporting A/E contracts	300,000	300,000
Maximum amount per unit for family housing improvement	30,000	30,000
Maximum annual rental for family housing in the U.S., Puerto Rico, or Guam	6,000	6,000
A. Maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country	16,800	16,800
B. Maximum number of family housing units that may be leased in foreign countries at any one time	30,000	30,000
Maximum rental per year for family housing facilities leased in a foreign country	250,000	250,000

The Department had requested that the threshold for the number of overseas leases be increased from 30,000 to 31,000. The committee did not approve the increase since the Department is embarked on a major building program overseas and 1,000 additional leases are not justified.

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 259 makes the provisions of this title effective October 1, 1984.

PART G—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Fiscal year—		Committee approved
	1984 enacted	1985 requested	
Army National Guard:	$66,826	$88,900	$97,000
Major construction	56,026	60,847	68,947
Minor construction	7,600	19,053	19,053
Planning and design	3,200	9,000	9,000
Army Reserve:	54,700	70,400	70,400
Major construction	42,200	56,350	56,350
Minor construction	4,600	5,550	5,550
Planning and design	7,900	8,500	8,500
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve:	28,245	60,800	62,000
Major construction	24,445	54,505	55,705
Minor construction	1,000	2,895	2,895
Planning and design	2,800	3,400	3,400
Air National Guard:	108,620	102,900	110,700
Major construction	94,520	87,000	94,800
Minor construction	5,500	7,900	7,900
Planning and design	8,600	8,000	8,000
Air Force Reserve:	41,200	67,800	67,800
Major construction	34,799	60,900	60,900
Minor construction	3,013	2,250	2,250
Planning and design	3,388	4,650	4,650
Total	$299,591	$390,800	$407,900

The authorization of appropriations approved by the committee for fiscal year 1985 totals $407,900,000 including major construction, minor construction, and planning and design in support of the Guard and Reserve Forces. This constitutes a 36 percent increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1984 and reflects consideration of the increasingly vital role of the Guard and Reserve Forces in improving the readiness capability of the total military force.

NMCRC CHARLOTTE, N.C. (LAND ACQUISITION)

It has come to the committee's attention that the replacement of the existing substandard Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center in Charlotte, N.C. could be satisfied by the purchase and rehabilitation of a former light manufacturing plant in nearby Matthews, N.C. Accordingly, the committee has added the necessary funding to procure this land and facility and urges the Naval Reserve to program a rehabilitation project at the earliest possible opportunity.

CAMP SHELBY—HATTIESBURG, MISSISSIPPI

Camp Shelby, Mississippi is the largest National Guard training facility in the United States with more than 40,000 troops training there yearly. The committee recognizes the importance of this facility and the tradition of outstanding performance of our National Guard and Reserve Components and, therefore, recommends $8,100,000 to upgrade and winterize the existing World War II facilities at Camp Shelby.

The committee has also expressed its position regarding restricted use of lands at Camp Shelby in section 263.

A.C. THOMPSON FIELD—JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

The committee recommends funding of $7,800,000 for a ramp extension and fuel system modification at A.C. Thompson Field, Jackson, Mississippi, to accommodate the stationing of eight C-141 aircraft for the strategic airlift mission of the Air National Guard.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASES IN WEST VIRGINIA

The committee strongly supports the "Land Use Master Development Plan" for the Air National Guard bases at Charleston and Martinsburg, West Virginia, as outlined by departmental witnesses testifying before the committee on March 23, 1984, as the best way to accelerate the full utilization, development and expansion of those bases, including the receipt of additional aircraft, should they become available.

The committee added $17,100,000 for additional projects and authorized one project to be accomplished with savings as reflected in the following summary:

SUMMARY OF GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES PROGRAM CHANGES

	Thousands
Total Guard and Reserve Forces authorization request	$390,800
Army National Guard	(88,900
Army Reserve	70,400
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	60,800
Air National Guard	102,900
Air Force Reserve	67,800
Committee additions:	
Army National Guard, Camp Shelby, Miss., winterize facilities	8,100
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, Charlotte, N.C. land acquisition	1,200
Army Reserve, Ripley, W. Va., U.S. Army Reserve Center	[1](1,300)
Air National Guard, Thompson Field, Jackson, Miss., aircraft ramp and fuel system modifications	7,800
Total additions	17,100
New Guard and Reserve Forces authorization	407,900
Army National Guard	97,000
Army Reserve	70,400
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	62,000

	Thousands
Air National Guard	110,700
Air Force reserve	67,800

[1] Project to be accomplished with savings.

The Department requested that the operation and maintenance (O&M) minor construction funding limit for Guard and Reserve Forces projects be raised from $50,000 to $100,000. The committee disapproved this request.

However, the committee does support the Departments' request to expand the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233(a)(6) to permit full Federal funding for the construction, alteration, or rehabilitation of critical portions of existing State-owned Army National Guard facilities (including armories) to accommodate changes in Department of Defense construction criteria/standards relating to the execution of Federal military missions.

The following summary represents the status of lump sum authorization provided continuously since the Guard and Reserve Forces facilities program reverted to this method of authorization in 1963:

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—ESTIMATED STATUS OF LUMP-SUM AUTHORIZATION [1] AS OF MAY 1, 1984

[In thousands of dollars]

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force		Total
	National Guard	Reserve		National Guard	Reserve	
Lump sum authorization (cumulative fiscal years 1963–84)	$641,647	$541,257	$356,915	$766,790	$250,948	$2,557,557
Estimate of authorization to be committed through fiscal year 1984	631,420	536,490	350,234	750,901	250,948	2,519,993
Uncommitted balance	10,227	4,767	6,681	12,889	0	34,564
Added by present bill	97,000	70,400	62,000	110,700	67,800	407,900
Total available, fiscal year 1985	107,227	75,167	68,621	123,589	67,800	442,464
Estimated commitments in fiscal year 1985	97,000	73,444	62,305	117,155	67,800	417,704
Estimated residual authorization, end fiscal year 1985	10,227	1,723	6,376	6,434	0	24,760

[1] Figures include planning and design and minor construction for fiscal year 1984–85 in accordance with Public Law 97–214.

PART H--GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions contained in Part H are nonrecurring provisions which for the most part amend previous statutes and which are designed to grant new authorities to the secretaries of the military departments or the directors of the defense agencies. The enactment of these provisions will provide the Department of Defense with the necessary authority to better manage its military construction programs and resources.

OCCUPANT LIABILITY

Section 271 would modify section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, concerning liability of service members for damages to housing, equipment, and furnishing. The modification would extend the liability for damages to a family housing unit to include unaccompanied personnel housing units by any service member, their dependents, or their guests.

OCCUPANCY OF SUBSTANDARD FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

The Department had recommended a provision which would permit the Secretary to charge a Service member a flat rate of 75 percent of his BAQ for occupying substandard quarters. Current law provides that the Service member who occupies substandard quarters must pay the cost of operating and maintaining those quarters, provided that such payment may not exceed 75 percent of a member's BAQ. The committee did not approve the new provision and recommends that current law be continued.

ACQUISITION OF OPTIONS ON PROPERTY

Section 272 would modify section 2677 of title 10, United States Code, to raise the percentage of the fair market value of property that may be paid as consideration for acquiring an option on that property from 5 percent to 12 percent. Under current market conditions property owners are generally unwilling to encumber their property for such a low rate of return and the Services have rarely been able to acquire options on needed property. As a result the Services either have to pay much more for the property or prime sites are lost to private developers. The rate increase is based upon an analysis of real world market conditions.

ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY; COST VARIATIONS

Section 273 would amend section 2676 of title 10, United States Code to avoid increased project costs due to interest that is charged from the date of the court judgment on real estate condemnation actions that are beyond the control of the contracting officer. Also the cost variation language of section 2676 is made applicable to land acquired by condemnation.

AUTHORIZED COST VARIATIONS

Section 274 would modify section 2853(e) of title 10, United States Code, to exclude reporting cost variations of projects below the maximum amount for unspecified minor construction projects. (Currently $1 million.) While cost variation reports are not required for projects estimated to cost less than the maximum amount for unspecified minor construction projects based on bids received, reporting is often required because of subsequent change orders or contractor claims. The proposed change would eliminate any cost variation reports for projects below the maximum amount for unspecified minor construction projects.

PREMOBILIZATION AUTHORITY

Section 275 would amend section 2808 of title 10, United States Code, to permit mobilization construction prior to a declaration of war or national emergency. This would allow DOD to begin priority mobilization construction if the President determines there is an imminent threat to national security.

RESTORATION OF PERMITTED LAND

Section 276 would add a new section to chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, which would permit the military departments to carry out restoration commitments on land permitted by another military department or Federal agency when required by terms of the permit making such land available. This would allow a Federal agency which agrees to restore land permitted to it by a second Federal agency to carry out the agreement notwithstanding a GAO decision to the contrary.

REPEAL OF LIMITS ON PROJECTS IN SUPPORT OF THE MASTER RESTATIONING PLAN

Section 107, Public Law 97-321, placed restrictions on two projects in the fiscal year 1983 Military Construction Authorization Act at Vilseck, FRG, in the amount of $26.5 million. These projects could not be executed until there was progress in the Master Restationing Plan negotiations between the U.S. and the FRG. These projects at Vilseck are independent of the Master Restationing Plan and need to be completed regardless of progress on negotiations. Section 277 repeals section 107 of Public Law 97-321.

SALES OF ELECTRICITY FROM ALTERNATIVE ENERGY AND COGENERATION PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Section 278 provides a means for the military departments to dispose by sale to utilities of electrical energy produced from alternative energy or cogeneration production facilities which is excess to the needs of the installation whereon the production facility is located. It authorizes the sale of such power to utilities and then allows the receipts or credits obtained therefrom to be applied toward the electric bills of other DOD installations.

Section 2481 of 10 U.S.C. is the only statutory basis for the sale of utilities by DOD activities. That section does not contemplate the kinds of sales of electric power presently facing the military as a result of its active alternate energy program. The Department of Defense expects to have substantial quantities of electrical energy to be available for use by installations and activities other than those whereon the electric power is produced. This proposal will provide a means for the military departments to enter into sales contracts with local utilities so that the benefits from such sales contracts can be used to offset or reduce the electric bills of other military installations. Without this proposal military departments will be forced to enter into wheeling arrangements with local utilities which may not be cost effective or practical or simply delay development until some means of moving such power is available. When the Navy came forward with the original proposals relating to the development of the geothermal resources at China Lake Naval Weapons Station, a major consideration was the recognition that power produced therefrom would be available to be credited to other military installations. This proposal provides the necessary legislative authority to accomplish this goal there and with regard to all DOD alternate energy or cogeneration production facilities.

EXPEDITING CONTINGENCY AND EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The Department recommended that existing law concerning contingency and emergency construction be revised by striking out the 21-day waiting period for congressional review. The committee did not approve this revision. Congress should have the opportunity to object if funds are being proposed for emergency or contingency construction that the Congress does not agree with.

REPLACEMENT OF WAREHOUSE FACILITIES, CAMP PENDLETON MARINE CORPS BASE, CALIFORNIA

Section 279 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to accept replacement warehouse facilities built by California Edison Company on Camp Pendleton at no cost to the United States in exchange for the continued use of 84 acres of land by California Edison Company.

REPLACEMENT OF SUBSTANDARD HOUSING, CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA

Section 280 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of the Sterling Homes enlisted housing complex in Oceanside, California and to use the sale proceeds to construct replacement family housing units on the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton. With this authority and the transfer of $15,000,000 from the family housing maintenance account to the construction account the Marine Corps will be able to replace the existing inadequate units. The replacement units would be constructed in a much preferable location in close proximity to on-base exchange, social service and recreational facilities. Because the Sterling Homes property is in such poor condition the City is most anxious for it to be sold and redeveloped as an attractive and economically productive area of the community. The Marine Corps had programed $15,000,000 for repair of the Sterling Homes housing units but much prefer this replacement alternative. The committee feels that this proposal in the best interest of both the Marine Corps and the City of Oceanside.

TELEPHONE WIRING

Section 281 allows the secretaries of the military departments to use appropriated funds to install and/or maintain interior telephone wiring. The installation and use of the telephone would still be the occupants responsibility. The necessity for this provision arose with the breakup of AT&T.

DEMOLITION OF TEMPORARY BUILDINGS

The committee has placed emphasis on the replacement of World War II temporary wooden structures. The Air Force and the Navy have aggressive programs that will rid them of most of their World War II building inventory by 1990. The Army has not aggressively pursued this effort. Section 282 requires the Army to tear down one square foot of World War II building space for every square foot of new facility that is added to the inventory. The section includes a sunset provision and allows the secretary of the Army to waive the requirement to demolish an amount of such wooden structures of not more than 20 percent of the area of new facilities added to the Army's inventory in any single year.

CONSTRUCTION OF SECTION 6 SCHOOLS

Section 6 Schools are dependent schools on military bases that are run by the military. The Department of Defense objective is to get these schools transferred to operation by local school districts. This year the Department has requested funds for the first time to renovate these schools. Section 283 requires agreement by the local school district to take over operation of the schools before construction is started.

TEST OF INNOVATIVE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING METHODS

The Congress has long insisted that the Department of Defense award construction contracts to the lowest bidder based on detailed plans and specifications. In some cases there may be advantages in awarding contracts for selected projects under other construction contracting methods used in the private sector. Accordingly, section 284 is included in this Act which will allow the award of construction contracts on a test basis at one Air Force installation using either turnkey competitive negotiation methods (commonly called one-step) or construction management techniques consistent with 10 U.S.C. 2855. The Secretary of the Air Force, within two years following enactment of this Act, shall submit a report on the results of such test to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The report shall include a detailed analysis of comparative costs of the contract administration procedures used versus conventional contract administration procedures and recommendations for any legislative changes necessary to implement improvements to contracting procedures for military construction projects.

CONTRACTS FOR ARCHITECT ENGINEER SERVICES

Last year the committee directed that the Department of Defense review the contracting procedures and pattern of awards for architectural and engineering services and construction design services to ascertain the impact of current practices on that industry.

The Department of Defense is the largest Federal employer of private architect-engineer firms to accomplish the construction design of military construction projects. For the past three years the Armed Services Committee has been concerned about two aspects of the Department's policies and procedures with regard to the award of architect-engineer contracts.

First, there is the concern that the Department's policies and procedures are biased against truly small architect-engineer firms. Today, there are over 30,000 architect-engineer firms in the United States and the average size firm employs 10 to 12 people. However, based on definitions of small businesses promulgated by the Small Business Administration rules an architect-engineer firm with 200 employees is considered "a small business." In fact, only about 200 firms of the 30,000 total firms have more than 200 employees. All firms of up to about 200 employees are permitted to compete for all set-aside contracts. As a consequence, the truly small, local firms—those closer to the industry size average—have very little chance to compete successfully for Defense Department design work. Second, under the Defense Department "Rule of Two" all architect-engineer contracts are set-aside for small business if two or more small architect-engineer firms are considered qualified to do the work. Since by definition a small architect-engineer firm can have up to 200 employees, there is very little Defense design work that is not set-aside for competition for only small firms. The impact of this "Rule of Two" is to virtually eliminate the top 200 design firms from being able to compete for Defense design contracts.

The committee has repeatedly expressed its concern on these issues to the Defense Department. In 1982, its report on the fiscal year 1983 Military Construction Authorization Act requested a review of the situation. During hearings on the fiscal year 1984 Military Authorization the Committee was distressed to learn the Department had made no progress in trying to come to grips with these issues. At the time of passage of the 1984 Act in the Senate the committee requested that the Department implement its proposed, revised regulations to provide for fair competition among architectural engineering firms and to submit a report on the review of Defense Department policies and procedures to the Armed Services Committee to demonstrate the Department intends to protect the interests of the truly small, local architect-engineer firms and to guarantee that the largest architect-engineer firms are not precluded from competing for Defense design contracts.

The committee has received a report from the Department which is not responsive. The report fails to address the issues requested by the committee. In view of the failure of the Department to be responsive and the continued adverse impact of the Department practices on truly small businesses and freezing out large businesses from the competitive process, the committee finds it necessary to take the extraordinary step to mandate provisions for the Department to change its practices.

The committee has included language in this bill, see section 285, to place in permanent law the $85,000 contract threshold. Above $85,000 AE contracts are to be open to all competitors; below $85,000 the contracts are set aside for small firms. The Secretary of Defense is given authority to revise the $85,000 threshold after fiscal year 1985 to insure that small firms get a reasonable share of Defense AE contracts. The term reasonable share has not been defined in law, and that determination is left to the Secretary. It is intended that the Department use the Annual Report of the Federal Procurement Data Center (FPDC) to calculate the appropriate number of contract actions which represent a reasonable share of contract awards and that the quarterly reports of the FPDC be used to monitor the point at which a reasonable share of awards have been made to small businesses through the set-aside procedures. The FPDC reports should also be used to monitor awards to truly small firms which the committee believes have been neglected by the agencies. The committee is disturbed by the trend of increased use of open-ended design contracts instead of the breakout of smaller, definitized contracts which would increase opportunities for truly small firms to compete. These provisions are not intended to in any way restrict awards to small businesses under the 8(a) program, or in any open competition procedure.

The Secretary is directed to include in its annual military construction report to the Congress additional information describing the number of contracts for architectural and engineering services and construction design awarded during the previous year. The information should also shall include the number of contracts set aside for small business, the number awarded to small business, the number available for competition by qualified firms of all sizes, and the number of contracts awarded to other than small businesses.

LAND FXCHANGE FOR CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (CSOC)

Section 286 would authorize the Air Force to acquire lands in the vicinity of Falcon AFS, Colorado (site of CSOC). Colorado has indicated its willingness to enter into a no cost exchange of land for restrictive easements to protect CSOC and provide expansion potential.

LAND CONVEYANCE, TUSTIN, CALIFORNIA

Section 287 authorizes the Navy to convey a roadway right-of-way in exchange of an aviation easement for helicopter arrivals and departures at Tustin Marine Corps Air Station.

LAND CONVEYANCE, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Section 288 authorizes the Air Force to convey 150 acres of March Air Force Base to the Village West Foundation in exchange for land or cash based on fair market value. The purpose is to provide an Air Force "Widows' Home" in California similar to the one at San Antonio, Texas.

LAND CONVEYANCE, LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

Section 289 authorizes the Army to convey at fair market value 150 acres of land adjacent to Vandenberg Air Force Base to the city of Lompoc for siting a non-profit western Spaceport Museum and Science Center.

LAND CONVEYANCE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Section 290 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to convey 3.35 acres of land with improvements to the San Diego Unified Port District. The San Diego Unified Port District is to construct a suitable replacement facility and pay for Navy relocation costs.

LAND EXCHANGE, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Section 291 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to convey two parcels of land comprising a portion of the Naval Air Station, Miramar, San Diego, California. In consideration the city will convey 280 acres abutting the boundaries of the Naval Station, Miramar to the United States.

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR NEW HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

This provision is in consonance with the report language included under Areas of Special Emphasis, wherein the committee directs DOD to establish an independent Blue Ribbon Panel to look at the sizing of military hospitals. The intent of the provision is to permit site development to proceed at the two new major hospitals authorized in this bill, but to defer construction work on new facilities of a particular size until the results of the Blue Ribbon Panel are available to the Congress.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY MATTERS

PURPOSE OF THIS TITLE

Title III provides authority for appropriations to the Secretary of Energy for the operating expenses, capital equipment, and construction costs related to the National Defense Programs of the Department of Energy.

BACKGROUND

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Law 95-91, enacted on August 4, 1977 established the Department of Energy. The national security functions relating to the management and implementation of the nuclear weapons program and other national security activities involving nuclear weapons research and development were transferred from the Energy Research and Development Agency to the Department of Energy. These are essentially the same national security functions formerly accomplished by the Atomic Energy Commission.

SENATE JURISDICTION OVER NUCLEAR ENERGY MATTERS

Committee jurisdiction over all nuclear energy matters was exercised by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from 1946 to 1977. Following the adoption of Senate Resolution 4 on February 4, 1977, the Joint Committee was abolished and jurisdiction was divided between the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The Committee on Armed Services was given jurisdiction over national defense programs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was given jurisdiction over the remainder of the activities of the Department of Energy.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

National Defense Programs of the Department of Energy involve research and development, testing, production, and maintenance of the nuclear weapons that are the heart of our deterrent nuclear weapon systems. The Department of Energy has seven programs with national security objectives as follows:

(1) Naval reactors development,
(2) Weapons activities,
(3) Verification and control technology,
(4) Materials production,
(5) Defense waste and byproducts management,
(6) Nuclear security and safeguards, and
(7) Security investigations.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Committee Hearings

S. 2459 was referred to the Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee for recommendation to the full committee. The subcommittee held hearings on the bill on March 27, 1984 and received testimony from Mr. Robert L. Morgan, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs; Dr. Richard L. Wagner, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy); Dr. Roger E. Batzel, Director, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Dr. George C. Dacey, President, Sandia National Laboratories; and Dr. Donald M. Kerr, Jr., Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Authorization Recommended

The authorizations recommended for fiscal year 1985 are shown in the table below:

SUMMARY OF CHANGES—FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1985 request	Authorization recommended	Change
Total, operating expenses	5,941.144	5,669.044	−272.100
Total, plant construction	1,379.450	1,217.750	−161.700
Total, capital equipment	464.981	436.981	−28.000
Total DOE	7,785.575	7,323.775	−461.800

A detailed tabulation of the fiscal year 1985 recommendation follows:

FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1985 request	Authorization recommended	Change
Sec. 101—Operating expenses:			
Naval reactors development:			
Plant development	63.900	63.900	0
Reactor development	229.300	229.300	0
Reactor operation	122.000	122.000	0
Program direction	11.200	11.200	0
Total	426.400	426.400	0
Weapons activities:			
Research and development	815.625	805.625	−10.000

FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1985 request	Authorization recommended	Change
Testing	548.000	532.000	−16.000
Inertial confinement fusion	125.000	155.000	+30.000
Production and surveillance	1,947.900	1,787.900	−160.000
Program direction	60.229	60.229	0
Total	3,496.754	3,340.754	−156.000
Verification and control technology:			
Verification and control tech	70.500	70.500	0
Program direction	3.200	3.200	0
Total	73.700	73.700	0
Materials production:			
Uranium enriching	245.300	142.800	−102.500
Reactor operations	557.235	551.235	−6.000
Processing	412.770	409.770	−3.000
Supporting services	257.985	253.385	−4.600
Program direction	20.300	20.300	0
Total	1,493.590	1,377.490	−116.100
Defense waste and byproducts management:			
Interim waste management	240.400	240.400	0
Long term waste management technology	90.400	90.400	0
Terminal storage	25.800	25.800	0
Program direction	2.100	2.100	0
Total	358.700	358.700	0
Nuclear safeguards and security:			
Nuclear safeguards and security	50.400	50.400	0
Program direction	7.600	7.600	0
Total	58.000	58.000	0
Security investigations: security investigations	34.000	34.000	0
Grand total, operating	5,941.144	5,729.044	−272.100
Sec. 102—Plant and capital equipment:			
Naval reactors development:			
85–N–101, general plant projects, VL	2.000	2.000	0
82–N–111, materials facility, SR	40.000	40.000	0
81–T–112, modifications to prototypes, VL	6.000	6.000	0
Total	48.000	48.000	0
Weapons activities:			
85–D–101, general plant projects, VL	31.600	29.600	−2.000
85–D–111, general plant projects, VL	32.200	30.200	−2.000
85–D–102, facilities revitalization RDT&E, VL	56.600	35.400	−21.200
85–D–103, security enhancements, LLNL	4.700	4.700	0
85–D–104, assembly bldg, LASL	.800	.800	0
85–D–105, assembly bldg, NV	3.000	3.000	0
85–D–106, radiography facility, LLNL	.800	.800	0
85–D–112, uranium recovery improvements, Y–12	4.500	4.500	0
85–D–113, power plant, Pantex	4.500	4.500	0
85–D–114, safeguards vaults, Y–12	3.100	3.100	0
85–D–115, utility systems, RF	5.800	5.800	0

FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1985 request	Authorization recommended	Change
85–D–121, pollution control facilities, Y–12	5.000	5.000	0
85–D–122, safeguards, Mound	2.700	2.700	0
85–D–123, safeguards, Pantex	1.000	1.000	0
85–D–124, safeguards, RF	1.000	1.000	0
85–D–125, tactical bomb facilities, VL	10.000	10.000	0
84–D–102, laboratory, SNL	20.000	20.000	0
84–D–103, guard force facility, LASL	5.600	5.600	0
84–D–104, storage facility, LASL	6.500	6.500	0
84–D–105, security upgrade, LASL	10.100	10.100	0
84–D–106, security upgrade, SNL	2.300	2.300	0
84–D–107, facilities revitalization, NV	34.900	21.900	–13.000
84–D–112, Trident II facilities, VL	60.700	60.700	0
84–D–113, ASW warhead facilities, VL	15.000	0	–15.000
84–D–114, manufacturing facility, RF	21.100	18.100	–3.000
84–D–115, electrical system, Pantex	10.000	10.000	0
84–D–117, test facility, Pantex	11.700	11.700	0
84–D–118, HE assembly facility, Pantex	40.000	0	–40.000
84–D–119, railroad track, Pantex	6.800	6.800	0
84–D–120, test facility, Mound	16.900	16.900	0
84–D–121, safeguards, RF	11.200	11.200	0
84–D–124, environmental improvements, Y–12	21.400	21.400	0
84–D–211, safeguards, Y–12	8.000	8.000	0
84–D–212, safeguards, Pinellias	2.700	2.700	0
83–D–124, SM–2 warhead facilities, VL	9.000	0	–9.000
83–D–199, buffer land acquisition, LLNL	17.000	7.000	–10.000
82–D–107, restoration, VL	175.100	161.600	–13.500
82–D–111, interactive graphics, VL	6.800	6.800	0
82–D–144, simulation lab, SNL	16.500	11.500	–5.000
82–D–146, production support facilities, VL	10.000	0	–10.000
82–D–150, materials R&D facility, LLNL	16.800	16.800	0
81–D–101, PBFA II, SNL	3.500	3.500	0
81–D–115, MX warhead facilities, VL	20.900	20.900	0
81–D–120, control of pollutants, Y–12	1.400	1.400	0
81–D–134, earthquake damage restoration, SLL	4.900	4.900	0
79–7–0, universal pilot plant, Pantex	3.800	3.800	0
Total	757.900	614.200	–143.700
Verification and control technology: 85–D–171, space science lab, LASL	1.000	1.000	0
Materials production:			
85–D–131, general plant projects, VL	32.000	30.000	–2.000
85–D–132 plant engineering and design, VL	2.000	2.000	0
85–D–136, protection system, RL	3.300	3.300	0
85–D–137, vault system, RL	2.500	2.500	0
85–D–139, fuel processing, ID	10.000	10.000	0
85–D–140, productivity improvements, Fernald	6.000	6.000	0
85–D–142, fuel tube facilities, SR	8.000	8.000	0
85–D–145, chemical facility, SR	1.800	1.800	0
84–D–130, processing facility, SR	.200	.200	0
84–D–134, safeguards, SR	14.900	14.900	0
84–D–136, conversion facility, Y–12	8.000	8.000	0
84–D–137, security upgrade, ID	8.000	8.000	0
83–D–146, water pollution control, Fernald	4.100	4.100	0
83–D–147, discharge elimination, SR	2.150	2.150	0
83–D–148, hazardous waste management, SR	11.500	11.500	0
83–D–180, storage modifications, VL	6.500	6.500	0
82–D–124, restoration, VL	72.800	68.800	–4.000
82–D–128, security, ID	.400	.400	0
82–D–136, processing facilities, ID	1.000	1.000	0

FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1985 request	Authorization recommended	Change
82–D–201, plutonium recovery, SR	28.800	28.800	0
Total	223.550	217.550	– 6.000
Defense waste:			
85–D–156, general plant projects, VL	25.645	23.645	– 2.000
85–D–157, storage bins, ID	7.000	7.000	0
85–D–158, warehouse, RL	.700	.700	0
85–D–159, waste transfer facilities, SR	11.000	11.000	0
85–D–160, security upgrade, ID	2.000	2.000	0
83–D–157, waste storage facility, RL	3.155	3.155	0
81–T–105, defense waste processing facility, SR	238.000	238.000	0
77–13–f, waste isolation pilot plant, NM	61.100	51.100	– 10.000
Total	348.600	336.600	– 12.000
Grand total, plant and construction	1,379.450	1,217.750	– 161.700
Capitol equipment:			
Naval reactors development	22.500	22.500	0
Weapons activities	261.850	239.850	– 22.000
Inertial confinement fusion	9.500	9.500	0
Verification and control technology	2.000	2.000	0
Materials production	128.660	122.660	– 6.000
Defense waste	35.771	35.771	0
Safeguards and security	4.700	4.700	0
Total	464.981	436.981	– 28.000

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

The Naval Reactors Development program is an integrated effort involving the design, development, improvement, testing, evaluation, and disposition of naval nuclear propulsion reactor plant components and cores. The objective is to enhance the performance, reliability, and safety of naval reactors while simplifying plant operating and maintenance requirements; and to design and develop advanced reactors for use in improving the capability of present and future nuclear powered naval warships.

Nuclear propulsion plants currently power over 40% of the Navy's first line combatant vessels. With nuclear power these ships are able to operate alone and unsupported for great periods of time, free from dependence on logistical support for propulsion fuel. Keeping these ships running is vital to the national defense—the most survivable leg of our strategic defense triad depends on the success of this effort.

Equally important is continuing to develop advanced naval reactor plants. The U.S. Navy depends on continued improvement in all aspects of its warships to be able to meet its international commitments. The design and development of improved reactor plants is essential to maintaining the qualitative edge we currently enjoy over the Soviets in this important area.

As their capabilities increase, our warships must become even more resilient and survivable. Toward this end, the program emphasizes improvement of reactor plant features to facilitate casualty control and recovery from battle damage. Longer term efforts of benefit to the nuclear weapons program are directed toward developing advanced reactors with improved performance aimed at increasing maneuverability, enhancing target acquisition, reducing transit time to and from station, increasing overall effectiveness in a combat situation, increasing operational availability, reducing the need for costly refuelings, minimizing the production of nuclear waste, and reducing personnel radiation exposure.

In this regard, work is underway on an Advanced Fleet Reactor which will provide improved plant performance for the next generation of nuclear powered attack submarines; a Developmental Materials Core to evaluate the operational response of new reactor core poisons and materials; and a Submarine Test Core to test improved reactor fuels, materials, and configurations which could provide higher plant performance. Many recent advances made under the Naval Reactors Development program have been incorporated into operating plants. Continued monitoring, improvement, and testing of these advances is an important aspect of the program effort. This work includes: the S8G reactor plant used in the Trident ballistic missile submarine and the higher power, longer life D2W core. Other ongoing efforts include: testing new reactor cores, components, concepts, and materials through the operation and servicing of eight land-based prototype nuclear propulsion plants; development and evaluation of new and improved fuels and materials for potential use in nuclear propulsion plants; investigation of reactor concepts which offer the potential of increased power density and longer life; improvement, evaluation, and technical support of existing nuclear propulsion plants, cores, components, systems, and materials; and development of replacement components and systems.

For fiscal year 1985, the Naval Reactors Development program budget request is $496.9 million. This provides for continuation of work in the areas listed above. The $3.9 million increase over the fiscal year 1984 budget is due to escalation and ongoing development work on advanced reactors. As part of the DOE initiative to obtain savings in the areas of administrative organization management, and administrative systems and processes, the Department was able to reduce this program by $1.1 million.

Committee Action

The committee approved these programs as requested.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Program Description

The weapons program budget provides for essential effort required to support the development, testing, production, and lifetime surveillance of safe and reliable nuclear weapons to meet national defense needs. A related effort involving research in inertial fusion is required for work relevant to weapons research, particularly with respect to laboratory-scale investigation of certain phenomena pertinent to weapons physics. Research, development, and testing activities in fiscal year 1985 will be pursued in support of weaponization (development engineering—Phase 3) requirements related to the W81 warhead for the Standard Missile-2, the W87 warhead for the Peacekeeper system, the Trident II warhead, and the Advanced Air-to-Surface Missile system warhead. This budget is structured to continue to increase the level of effort for the technology base, particularly in areas related to strategic defensive technologies, while still being responsive to the near-term needs for weaponization. The research and development employment in the weapons laboratories is planned to increase by about 300 full-time equivalents.

The testing budget will support nuclear device tests in fiscal year 1985 and allow for the preparation required to support the testing effort in future years. The level of testing effort will support tests related to the weaponization effort in the laboratories and tests for effort related to future requirements. Emphasis will be placed upon obtaining experimental information in the most cost-effective manner.

With regard to the inertial fusion effort, the funds requested in fiscal year 1985 support efforts to build a base of physics understanding required for weapons design technology and target design requirements for ignition. The data obtained by experiments will support an evaluation in the fiscal year 1987 time frame of inertial fusion for further contributions to weapon physics research and for possible development as an energy source.

The budget also provides for the production of new nuclear weapons for the stockpile and for the surveillance and maintenance of existing stockpile weapons as approved by the President. Included are the full-scale production of the B61-3 and -4 bombs, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W79 warhead for the Artillery Fired Atomic Projectile, the W80-0 warhead for the Sea Launched Cruise Missile, the W80-1 warhead for the Air Launched Cruise Missile, the B83 Strategic Bomb, the W84 warhead for the Ground Launched Cruise Missile, and the W85 warhead for the Pershing II Missile and predelivery production effort for the W81 warhead for the Standard Missile-2, the W87 warhead for the Peacekeeper missile, and the Trident II warhead.

COMMITTEE ACTION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Research and development.—For reasons of budgetary constraint, the committee has reduced the R&D operating budget by $10 million. The amount allowed permits real growth in the R&D operating account of more than 5 percent. The committee urges that this real growth be applied in the basic research area.

The committee has supported the Defense Department's budget request of $10 million for a cooperative research effort with the DOE labs in the area of conventional munitions. The committee believes that the talent and the analytical capability at the DOE labs can bring a new dimension to DOD conventional munitions R&D.

To supplement this DOD funding, the committee directs that the Secretary of Energy earmark a matching $10 million from funds authorized in this account to enable high priority conventional munitions efforts of benefit to the nuclear weapons program with potential for early payoff, to be accelerated.

Testing.—For reasons of budgetary constraint, the committee has reduced the account for nuclear weapons testing by $16 million. The committee recognizes that this action may reduce the number of possible tests for fiscal year 1985 by one; however, the committee feels that by increasing the number of experiments accomplished with each test, the Department can accommodate this reduction without major impact.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—Inertial confinement fusion (ICF) is a research and development program directed toward demonstrating the feasibility of burning very small masses of thermonuclear fuel through the use of lasers or particle beam generators. Understanding of the physics of small fuel-mass burn can assist the nuclear weapons research, development, and testing activity by providing measurements of material properties at very high densities and temperatures; data on processes occurring during the implosion of fuel masses; and simulation of some nuclear weapon effects. If sufficiently small fuel masses can be ignited using lasers of particle beams, inertial fusion may also have the potential of being, in the long-term, a means of commercial power production if cost effective drivers can be developed.

The program plan includes the completion of the large facilities in progress at the three lead laboratories: the Antares gas laser facility at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the NOVA glass laser facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the Particle Beam Fusion Accelerator-II (PBFA-II) facility at Sandia National Laboratories at Albuquerque, New Mexico. In concert with the facility construction, experiments are planned by the lead laboratories and by the major supporting laboratories to gather an adequate data based to ensure the effective use of the full scale facilities as they become operational between fiscal years 1984 to 1986. The glass laser experimental activity is supported by KMS Fusion, Ann Arbor, Michigan, the Laboratory for Laser Energetics of the University of Rochester, and the Naval Research Laboratory. The Naval Research Laboratory also supports the pulse power activity at the Sandia Laboratory in the development of diodes. Recent accomplishments have been acknowledged as outstanding. The major supporting laboratories extend the talent and resource base of the program and provide capabilities not available in the mainline programs at the national laboratories. For example, the pellet fabrication capability of KMS Fusion meets requirements of other participants in the program, and the highest power laser now available for direct illumination of targets is that at the University of Rochester. Further, these laboratories have pioneered experimental work on a number of critical issues: efficient short wavelength conversion of glass lasers at the University of Rochester; short wavelength illumination experiments and cryogenic targets at KMS Fusion; and ablative acceleration of flat targets at the Naval Research Laboratory.

The committee has strongly supported the national inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) program for almost a decade, with cumulative appropriations of more than $1.6 billion, because of the significant technical contributions the program has made to the understanding of nuclear weapon physics, nuclear weapon radiation effects, directed energy weapon efforts, and for its potential contribution in the long term to fusion energy production. In addition, the committee believes that the existence of significant programs at the nuclear weapon laboratories which push the leading edge of both science and technology and are closely related and useful to the national nuclear weapons program are both beneficial and essential in maintaining the overall viability and technical excellence of these institutions over the long term.

At this time, two major facilities in the program—the Antares gas laser facility at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the NOVA gas laser facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory—are transitioning from construction to full operation. Testimony before the committee, together with additional input received from the Department of Energy (DOE) indicated that the weapon physics contribution of the ICF program is well underway and making important contributions in many areas of nuclear weapon physics and to the understanding of x-ray lasers.

In fiscal year 1985, the Antares and NOVA facilities will be in full operation. Construction funding is complete and an increase in operating funds may be necessary for operation and maintenance of these large facilities. However, the budget recommendation for fiscal year 1985 reflects a cut in operating funds.

The committee feels that a cut in operating funds at this point in the program is not purdent. To reduce the teams of dedicated scientists put together by the various laboratories at a time when the systems are transitioning from construction to operation would deny the systems the capability to produce the useful scientific data that they have been designed for. Therefore, the committee has increased the operating funds for this program by $30 million.

In addition, the committee feels that the program is in need of stability and guidance from outside experts. Therefore, the committee has added a general provision (section 332) requiring the President to set up a Technical Review Group with the charter to look into the ICF program and to lay out a program for future work. The committee hopes that such a review can lead to badly needed program stability.

Production and surveillance.—The committee has deferred action related to two warheads, the SM-2 and the advanced ASW warheads. In consonance with this action, the committee has reduced this account by $160 million. The committee also feels that cost growth in some warheads is excessive and could be reduced with more intensive management. The committee is confident that the funding authorized is adequate to permit the DOE to meet its production schedules as contained in the current Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum.

CONSTRUCTION

Unless otherwise discussed herein, the committee has deferred certain construction projects as shown in the above table, solely for reasons of budgetary constraint. While the projects represent valid facility requirements, the committee felt that they could be deferred without unduly jeopardizing health and safety or warhead production schedules.

Projects 84-D-113 and 83-D-124 are deferred in consonance with the committee action to delay production of the associated warheads.

The reduction of $21.2 million in project 85-D-102 will slow the construction of the high explosive application facility at Livermore Laboratory and a weapon laboratory building at Sandia Laboratory. Phase funding of construction of these two subprojects is not expected to result in an appreciable delay.

In the case of 84-D-118, high explosive subassembly facility, at the Pantex Plant, the design effort has been delayed and the requested construction funding is not required until fiscal year 1986.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

The reductions in capital equipment will primarily result in the deferral of the acquisition of some replacement equipment items for another year. For example, computer equipment will continue to be leased for an additional year instead of beginning acquisition in fiscal year 1985.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Verification and Control Technology program supports U.S. national security and foreign policy development and execution in the areas of treaty verification, intelligence arms control and export control as they relate to nuclear weapons issues. In fulfilling these responsibilities the program: (1) develops and produces technology to monitor nuclear explosions; (2) controls the export of technology related to DOE areas of responsibility; (3) provides technical and analytical support for the Department's role in nuclear arms control negotiations; and (4) manages DOE's intelligence functions.

Verification and Control Technology activities supported by operating expenses can be divided into two categories, detection technology and analytical support. Detection technology activities develop means of detecting nuclear weapons activities such as nuclear explosions. Analytical support activities utilize nuclear weapon technical expertise to evalute arms control proposals, make determinations on export license applications, technology transfer issues, and analyze foreign nuclear weapon-related activities. Verification and Control Technology efforts are carefully coordinated with the Departments of Defense, State, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Commerce, as well as with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee approved this program as requested.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Materials Production program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and non-defense requirements and sustain a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum and the annual Department of Energy Materials Management Plan.

To meet these objectives, the Materials Production program operates a reactor feed material production complex, four production reactors, spent fuel chemical processing plants, research and development efforts on long-range alternatives for production of nuclear materials, and support facilities integral to the operation of the facilities mentioned above. A fifth production reactor, L Reactor at Savannah River, was scheduled to become operational during fiscal year 1984. The start up of L Reactor, however, was delayed and is currently scheduled to begin operations during the second quarter of fiscal year 1985. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes. There is no cost effective alternative production method within the United States at present, or within the production planning period, for providing the nuclear materials required by the National Defense program, other Federal programs, and industry.

COMMITTEE ACTION

OPERATING EXPENSES

The committee recommends a reduction in the uranium enriching account of $90.5 million which would eliminate the changeover to the high productivity Mark 15 cores for plutonium at Savannah River. A new reactor core loading design is being developed which will not require near term major investments for enriched uranium. This new design approach, although not as productive as the Mark 15 core will still provide a significant productivity increase over the current reactor design. The remainder of the reduction in the uranium enrichment subprogram can be accommodated because of reduced requirements to support the N-Reactor.

The delay in the restart of the L Reactor at Savannah River to permit the construction of thermal mitigation measures required for compliance with the Clean Water Act will result in the availability of $6 million in the reactor operation account that will not be required for L-Reactor operations. Reductions of $3 million and $4.6 million are recommended in the Processing of Nuclear Materials and Supporting Services accounts respectively. These economies are recommended as a result of budgetary constraints.

The committee is aware of the Department's initiatives to develop a plutonium isotope separation process for use in separating critical isotopes from current nuclear streams. This process will have the capability to produce needed isotopes and to remove unwanted isotopes. The committee is concerned that this effort may be budgeted at a level which would not permit this technology to be fielded at the earliest practical time. Were it not for budgetary constraints the committee might consider accelerating this effort. The committee is also aware of the progress in the laser isotope separation process being developed in existing facilities at the Los Alamos Laboratory and strongly supports this pilot effort as requested in the President's budget.

CONSTRUCTION

The only reductions recommended in construction in support of this program are in projects 85-D-131, general plant projects, and 82-D-124, the restoration project, both of which are level of effort projects. The reductions recommended will result in the deferral of the lowest priority subprojects.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

The committee recommends a reduction of $6 million due to budgetary constraints.

DEFENSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCTS MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The goal of the Defense Waste and Byproducts Management (DWBM) program is to provide for safe interim storage or utilization of radioactive waste and byproducts generated primarily from nuclear materials production and naval propulsion while continuing the development of technologies and facilities for the final disposal of defense waste.

The program has three primary elements: Interim Waste Operations, Long-Term Waste Management Technology, and Terminal Storage. These elements provide mainly for the handling and disposal of low-level and airborne radioactive waste, the storage of transuranic and high-level waste, development of technology for the long-term management of radioactive waste, and the demonstration of the safe disposal of defense waste. The fiscal year 1985 budget supports the implementation of the policies contained in the Defense Waste Management plan which was prepared in response to PL 97-90 and signed by the President on June 16, 1983.

Fiscal year 1985 efforts in the Interim Waste Operations program will continue the upgrading of waste handling, storage, and disposal operations by transferring high-level waste from old single-shell tanks at Savannah River and Hanford into new double-shell tanks, construction of new facilities, improvement in existing facilities, upgrading of burial ground operations, and the management of defense surplus facilities. The long-term program in fiscal year 1985 will focus on the construction of the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), construction of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and preparation of transuranic waste at Idaho and other DOE sites to meet WIPP waste acceptance criteria.

The Defense Waste Processing Facility will provide the final step in processing high-level waste at Savannah River for disposal. Facility construction began in fiscal year 1984 leading to "hot" operations in fiscal year 1989. The DWPF will immobilize the high-level waste in borosilicate glass for storage, transportation to, and disposal in a geologic repository. Immobilization and confinement in a repository will insure the long-term isolation of this waste from the environment with minimal maintenance and surveillance.

The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, located near Carlsbad, New Mexico, will demonstrate the safe disposal of defense transuranic waste. The WIPP facilities will be capable of routine operations to receive, inspect, and emplace defense transuranic waste in a geologic disposal environment. This research and development facility will be sized to handle quantities typical of defense transuranic waste inventories and anticipated generation rates. Emplacement of transuranic waste in WIPP will begin in late 1988.

The characteristics of the defense transuranic wastes that will be placed permanently at WIPP, including their maximum surface dose rate and their maximum specific radioactivity, have been defined in the Final Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Department of Energy for the WIPP project.

Further, the WIPP facility will be used to host high-level defense waste experiments for a period of up to 30 years. These experiments will provide valuable information for use in designing and constructing permanent waste disposal sites for high level radioactive waste. They will be conducted in such a way that all high-level defense waste can be easily retrieved from the site. As envisioned in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the amount of high-level defense waste at the site at any one time will not exceed forty equivalents cannisters of defense high level waste. The WIPP facility is not to be used for permanent disposal of high-level waste from any source, defense or civilian.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee recommends a reduction of $2 million in General Plant Projects which will cause deferral of the lowest priority projects. Additionally, the committee recommends a reduction of $10 million in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. This minor reduction will not seriously impact the level of effort of the program.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Nuclear Safeguards and Security program is responsible for developing measures to assure adequate protection of DOE's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft and sabotage. The program also focuses on providing safeguards technical support to U.S. and international activities designed to minimize the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As part of this program, the classification activity is responsible for implementing the DOE's classification and declassification activities.

Recent accomplishments include the issuance of a revised threat statement which established performance goals against a range of potential adversaries. Validation of physical fitness standards for guards was also completed. Training and tests to bring the entire DOE protective force in compliance with these standards started during calendar year 1983. The upgrading of our facilities is continuing under the Safeguards and Security Improvement program. In addition, activities are underway to support site-specific safeguards and security improvements; reestablish airspace restrictions at critical DOE facilities; establish a centralized training facility for protective force personnel; and to systematically evaluate the significance of safeguards and security weaknesses. Cooperative efforts are underway to obtain timely backup for incident response.

Program objectives will emphasize improved effectiveness of safeguards and security through intensified guard forces training; improved personnel access control; evaluation of existing systems to meet site-specific needs; and assistance in implementation of safeguards improvements. Efforts will continue in support of classification activities, development of international safeguards, training of foreign safeguards personnel, tracking of nuclear materials shipments, and development of technology in physical protection and material control accounting.

Conduct of these activities will help meet the objectives of pertinent public laws and treaties/agreements and provide for better protection of DOE's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee has long been concerned with the security and safeguards at all DOE production and manufacturing facilities. The ramifications of an accident or an incident involving either special nuclear or high explosive material could cause irreparable harm to the Nation's necessary efforts to maintain and modernize our strategic nuclear deterrent. Recent additional efforts by the Department, with full congressional backing, have been expended in the security and safeguards area and must be continued.

Despite these enhanced efforts, the Department's Master Plan to achieve the desired level of security and safety is not scheduled for completion for several years. While this schedule is constrained by funding limitations and the need to phase many construction improvements with ongoing production efforts, particularly at the Pantex facility, the committee also believes that full implementation of the Master Plan is deserving of one of the highest priorites in the DOE Defense program.

Accordingly, the committee requests a report from the Secretary to be submitted no later than January 31, 1985 which shall include:

1. The security and safeguards deficiencies, by facility, and the elements and timetable of the Master Plan to correct these deficiencies;
2. The funding profiles, by fiscal year, to achieve the abovementioned goals; and
3. A prioritized listing of specific projects throughout the DOE weapons complex which require security and safeguards attention.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The objective of the Security Investigations program is to insure that the common defense and security of the United States is protected by an adequate background investigation and screening of those DOE and DOE contractor personnel who would, in the performance of their work, need access to Restricted Data, National Security Information or Special Nuclear Material, or who would occupy a designated Critical Sensitive position. The Office of Safeguards and Security is responsible for this activity.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee has approved the request as submitted.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions are essentially the same as those included in previous acts.

SECTION 321.—REPROGRAMING

This section defines and limits the authority of the Department to use funds appropriated pursuant to this bill for program amounts in excess of those amounts stated in the bill or for programs not yet considered by the Congress. In general the limitation on reprograming is 105 percent of the authorized amount; however exceptions are permitted subject to notification of the appropriate committees of the Congress. A provision in previous acts limiting total obligations to the total amount authorized in the bill is not included in the Department's request. The section recommended by the committee is identical to that enacted previously.

SECTION 322.—LIMITS ON GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS

This section authorizes small construction projects. The ceiling for these projects in the past has been $1 million. The Department requested that this ceiling be raised to $1.2 million for fiscal year 1985, but the committee does not feel that this increase can be justified and has retained the $1 million ceiling. The Department had also requested that the aggregate ceiling on General Plant Projects be dropped; however, the committee sees no need for this change and has recommended a provision identical to that enacted previously.

SECTION 323.—LIMITS ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

For construction projects costing in excess of $1 million, the Department must have line item authorization. The committee recognizes that estimating the cost of construction projects is not a precise science and has included this section to permit increases above the authorized amount by not more than 25 percent. Exceptions to this limitation are permitted subject to notification of the appropriate committees of the Congress. This section is essentially identical to that enacted in previous acts.

SECTION 324.—FUND TRANSFER AUTHORITY

This section provides that, when specified in the Appropriation Act, funds authorized to be appropriated by this bill may be transferred to other agencies for the performance of the work for which the appropriation is made, and permits merger of such funds with the appropriations to which they are transferred. This is standard language that has appeared in past annual authorization acts.

SECTION 325.—AUTHORITY FOR CONSTRUCTION DESIGN

The Department is authorized to proceed with the design for any construction project if the design cost (Title I and Title II) does not exceed $2 million; design work for such construction projects does not have to be specifically authorized by law. For construction projects where the design cost will exceed $2 million, line item authorization for the design is required. The appropriate committees of Congress are to be notified before design commences of any project whose design cost will exceed $300,000. This provision is identical to that included in previous acts.

SECTION 326.—AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION DESIGN

This section authorizes the use of any available funds to proceed with the design of urgently needed facilities. This section recognizes that new and urgent construction requirements can occur to support unforeseen weapons production requirements or to protect life. The committee would expect to be notified if this authority were ever used.

SECTION 327.—FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALL NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

This section authorizes the transfer of funds within National Defense program accounts and is an annually recurring provision.

SECTION 328.—ADJUSTMENTS FOR PAY INCREASES

This section authorizes increases in appropriations to accommodate Federal pay raises. The same provision was included in previous acts.

SECTION 329.—AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

This section permits appropriations made pursuant to this bill to remain available until expended.

SECTION 330.—CONTRACTOR LIABILITY FOR INJURY FROM TESTING

Section 330 would clarify the status of certain contractors that operate or operated Government-owned facilities relating to atomic energy national defense activities and are in litigation arising from those activities. Recently many suits have been brought against those contractors, alleging that exposure to radiation from the United States atomic weapons testing program resulted in personal injury or death.

Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), the United States is not liable and cannot be sued for acts of independent contractors providing goods or services to the United States. The contractors operating nuclear weapons testing facilities for the Department of Energy or its predecessor agencies, or those participating in the atomic weapons testing program, however, are unique. They are not typical of contract suppliers of commercially provided goods or services. Only the Government sets the policy, makes the decisions, and controls activities and circumstances regarding atomic weapon research, development, and testing. Consequently, these contractors were utilized by the United States as instruments of national policy to assist in this entirely governmental task.

Furthermore, the Government reimburses these contractors for any liability arising out of their assistance in the weapons program, including the costs of litigation. Accordingly, section 330 would cause all litigation involving the atomic weapons testing program, including suits now filed against contractors, to be maintained against the United States under the substantive and procedural requirements of the FTCA.

During the 35-year period beginning in 1945 through 1980, the Department of Energy, and its predecessor agencies (AEC and ERDA) directed a total of 693 announced nuclear tests of which 212 were conducted in the atmosphere. Following 140 of those tests, some radioactivity was detected off the site.

Early atmospheric nuclear device tests were made by the Manhattan Engineer District, a part of the Army Corps of Engineers under control of the Army Chief of Staff, the Secretary of War, and the President. These tests, and the preceding research and development work, were performed at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico. While the management of that laboratory was under contract to the University of California, its director, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, reported to an Army officer, Major General Leslie Groves, who, in turn, reported to the War Department.

In 1946, the atomic energy functions, including the responsibility for nuclear testing, that then resided in the War Department and the Manhattan Engineer District, were transferred to the newly created Atomic Energy Commission under the provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

The Atomic Energy Act established the paramount objective for atomic energy as that ". . . of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security." In the 1946 Act, the Congress stated that "The development, utilization, and control of atomic energy for military and for all other purposes are vital to the common defense and security." The Congress also stated that "Funds of the United States may be provided for the development and use of atomic energy under conditions which will provide for the common defense and security and promote the general welfare."

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 created a Division of Military Application within the AEC and prescribed that this division shall be directed by a military officer of general or flag grade. The act also created a Military Liaison Committee to deal with matters relating to the development, manufacture, use and storage of atomic weapons. The Act also provided that the Atomic Energy Commission, as agent and on behalf of the United States, would have absolute control of all special nuclear material production facilities. All of the above provisions were readopted and included in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorize only the Atomic Energy Commission (or its successor agencies) to do weapons research and development, including the testing of nuclear devices. Only the AEC (or its successor agencies) may engage in the production of nuclear weapons or weapon parts, and then *"only to the extent that the express consent and direction of President of the United States has been obtained,* [emphasis added] which consent and direction shall be obtained at least once each year."

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 direct the commission (and its successor agencies) to exercise its powers so as to ensure the continued conduct of research and development in several fields, including the military. The Congress also authorized and directed the Atomic Energy Commission and its succsssor agencies to make arrangements, including contracts, for the conduct of research and development relating to military purposes. Testing is a necessary part of research and development.

Each nuclear test that has been made since 1946 has been made under the statutory direction of Congress. Each nuclear test has been approved, before the fact, by the President of the United States. Each nuclear test has been under the direct supervision of government officials. Each nuclear test has been participated in by hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of government officials and military and civilian personnel.

The committee recognizes, as has the Congress, that the military applications of atomic energy could not proceed either technically or economically without the participation of organizations that possess both scientific management skills and a high degree of scientific and technical expertise. Several such organizations were placed under contract almost at the inception of the nuclear weapons program in 1942 and have performed in an outstanding manner in the national interest for more than three decades. These organizations have provided scientific, engineering and technical support for nuclear tests carried out by the government and for the government in the exercise of a governmental function, i.e., providing for the national defense. These organizations did not order the tests to be performed; they did not set the times or places for the tests; nor did they direct military or civilian government personnel to participate in them. It should appear, without question, that these contractors were acting as the de facto instruments of the United States Government in carrying out a governmental purpose.

In the litigious atmosphere that now pervades the United States, especially where atomic energy matters are concerned, literally thousands of plaintiffs have filed suits against the operators of the government laboratories that have participated in the government's nuclear weapons tests. These suits allege numerous causes of action, including human experimentation, breach of warranty, civil conspiracy, fraudulent concealment, violation of fundamental Constitutional rights, and negligence. Plaintiffs are seeking tens of billions of dollars in damages. Because the contractors are fully indemnified by the government under the terms of their contracts, the taxpayer will ultimately bear this burden.

During the period when atmospheric testing was done, 1946 to 1962, hundreds of thousands of military and civilian government personnel were involved in the tests and thousands of them may be expected to join in law suits against the laboratories.

Without the consolidation of these many cases under the leadership of the Department of Justice, with the United States as a codefendant, a variety of judgments are possible based on the provisions of a different state laws and on the verdicts of juries in various state and Federal courts.

If there is a connection between nuclear testing and the harm alleged in these many law suits, the committee believe that the remedy should be uniform. Also, the committee believes that the government's interest should receive the best uniform defense available. In addition the committee does not believe that any contractor should be used as an instrumentality of the government and then abandoned when inundated by a flood of litigation arising from that same government activity.

Section 330, as requested by the Administration, is essentially the same provision as passed by the Senate last year in S. 1107.

SECTION 331.—INDUSTRIAL FUNDING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The committee has from time to time expressed its concern with the coordination between the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Department of Defense (DOD) in the DOE Defense programs. In essence, the DOD gets its nuclear warheads "free" because it has no responsibility for funding the warheads. As a consequence, the DOE develops its budget based on requirements furnished by DOD and formalized in the annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum. Warhead requirements are "officially" developed by DOD, but in reality DOE provides DOD with warhead capability options and DOD selects an option without regard for cost, because DOE funds the warhead. The system simply has no cost discipline; in fact, the warhead funds are not formally reviewed by the national security apparatus in the Office of Management and Budget; they are reviewed by the energy and natural resources directorate.

To remedy this situation the committee has proposed bill language to require that beginning with the fiscal year 1986 budget, funds for the following DOE Defense programs will be included in the budget of the DOD:

—Weapons Activities
—Materials Production

The DOE will continue to execute these programs just as it does today, except that these DOE Defense programs will be accomplished as an industrially funded activity on a reimbursable basis. The committee would expect that this action would force cost discipline on the warhead procurement and when overall defense resource allocation decisions are made, the warheads would not be viewed as "free" by DOD.

SECTION 332.—REVIEW OF THE INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION PROGRAM

This new section has been discussed previously under the section on Weapon's Activities.

SECTION 333.—NUCLEAR NAVAL PROPULSION PROGRAM

This section gives the force of law to the Executive Order which established and set forth the function of the Office of Naval Nuclear Propulsion. The committee feels that it is important to retain the independent authority that has been the foundation of Admiral Rickover's success in managing the nuclear power program for the Navy.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

General Counsel of the Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1984.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith legislation, "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes."

In accordance with section 1110 of title 31, United States Code, we are also submitting herewith, as separate legislation, a similar request for authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1986.

These proposals are part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 98th Congress and the Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of these proposals would be in accord with the program of the President.

Title I provides procurement authorization for the military departments and for the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985. It contains a provision that extends for fiscal year 1985 the authority to waive certain costs in connection with the NATO AWACS program.

Title II provides for the authorization of each of the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations for the military departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985. The authorization contains a provision that authorizes the appropriation of funds that are necessary to cover increased pay costs and other employee benefits to preclude the necessity of submitting a request for supplemental authorization for such non-discretionary personnel costs.

Title III provides for authorization of the operation and maintenance appropriations of the military departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985. The authorization includes a provision that authorizes the appropriation of funds that are necessary to cover increased pay costs, unbudgeted increases in fuel costs, and inflation in the cost of activities covered by title III.

Title IV provides for the authorization of appropriations for the purpose of providing capital for working-capital funds of the military departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985.

Title V prescribes the end strengths for active duty personnel in each component of the Armed Forces as required by section 138(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for by the budget authority and appropriations requested for these components for fiscal year 1985.

Title VI provides for average strengths of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces as required by section 138(b) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for by the budget authority and appropriations requested for the Department of Defense in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985. Title VI also prescribes the end strengths for reserve component members on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of administering the reserve forces and provides for an increase in the number of certain enlisted and commissioned personnel who may be serving on active duty in support of the reserve components.

Title VII provides for civilian personnel end strengths for the Department of Defense as required by section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, in a number equal to that provided by the budget authority in appropriations requested for the Department of Defense in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985.

Title VIII provides for the average military training student loads as required by section 138(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for this purpose in the President's budget for fiscal year 1985.

Title IX consists of six general provisions. Section 901 amends section 139a of title 10, United States Code, relating to Selected Acquisition Reports. Section 902 amends section 139b of title 10, United States Code, relating to Unit Cost Reports. Section 903 authorizes the making of withdrawal credits in connection with the capitalization of aviation depot level repairable assets in the Navy Stock Fund. Section 904 amends parts of the Department of Education Organization Act relating to the transfer of the Defense Dependents' Education System to the Department of Education. Section 905 adds a new section 2401 to title 10, United States Code to authorize the provision of reciprocal communications support, supplies and services. Section 906 repeals section 1110 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1983 which prohibits the consolidation of the functions of the military transportation commands.

Sincerely,

L. NIEDERLEHNER,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosures.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985".

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons, and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition and for other procurement for the Army as follows:

For aircraft, $4,008,300,000.
For missiles, $3,442,400,000.
For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $5,092,700,000.
For ammunition, $2,494,000,000.
For other procurement $6,022,400,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), shipbuilding and conversion, and other procurement for the Navy as follows:

For aircraft, $11,474,200,000.
For weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), $4,650,860,000.
For shipbuilding and conversion, $13,141,900,000.
For other procurement $5,953,900,000.

(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons) in the amount of $1,978,581,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force as follows:

For aircraft, $28,676,500,000.
For missiles, $9,820,600,000.
For other procurement $9,561,500,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 105. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Defense Agencies in the amount of $1,243,500,000.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 106. Effective on October 1, 1984, section 103(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1984" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1985".

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 210. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $4,987,860,000.

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $9,833,576,000.

For the Air Force $14,401,955,000.

For the Defense Agencies, $4,770,296,000, of which $62,000,000 is authorized for the activities of the Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 such additional sums as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expense, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $19,486,518,000.

For the Navy, $26,248,426,000.

For the Marine Corps, $1,683,069,000.

For the Air Force, $20,234,500,000.

For the Defense Agencies, $7,338,370,000.

For the Army Reserve, $715,450,000.

For the Naval Reserve, $829,531,000.

For the Marine Corps Reserve, $58,642,000.

For the Air Force Reserve, $883,461,000.

For the Army National Guard, $1,404,643,000.

For the Air National Guard, $1,862,148,000.

For the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, $914,000.

For Defense Claims, $177,900,000.

For the Court of Military Appeals, $3,470,000.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a);

(2) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs; and

(3) for increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

TITLE IV—WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1985 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working-capital funds, in amounts as follows:

For the Army Stock Fund, $366,448,000.
For the Navy Stock Fund, $563,907,000.
For the Marine Corps Stock Fund, $34,908,000.
For the Air Force Stock Fund, $666,093,000.
For the Defense Stock Fund, $130,700,000.

TITLE V—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 501. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1985, as follows:

(1) The Army, 780,800.
(2) The Navy, 575,300.
(3) The Marine Corps, 199,500.
(4) The Air Force, 610,200.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 601. For fiscal year 1985 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programed to attain average strengths of not less than the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 440,100.
(2) The Army Reserve, 288,400.
(3) The Naval Reserve, 124,200.
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 44,300.
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 106,200.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 72,900.
(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 12,500.

(b) The average strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the

Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

SEC. 602. (a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 601, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1985, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 26,583.
(2) The Army Reserve, 15,027.
(3) The Naval Reserve, 15,410.
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 1,129.
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 7,224.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 623.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

SEC. 603. (a) The table in section 517(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	517	156	87	9
E-8	2,295	381	455	74".

(b) The table in section 524(a) of such title is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or lieutenant commander	2,261	823	471	100
Lieutenant colonel or commander	1,121	520	293	50
Colonel or navy captain	345	177	172	25".

(b) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on October 1, 1984.

TITLE VII—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 701. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized a strength in civilian personnel, as of September 30, 1985, of 1,084,836.

(b) The strength for civilian personnel prescribed in subsection (a) shall be apportioned among the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act on the manner in which the initial allocation of civilian personnel is made among the military departments and the agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) and shall include the rationale for each allocation.

(c)(1) In computing the strength for civilian personnel, there shall be included all direct-hire and indirect-hire civilian personnel employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense (other than those performed by the National Security Agency) whether employed on a full-time, part-time, or intermittent basis, but excluding special employment categories for students and disadvantaged youth such as the stay-in-school campaign, the temporary summer aid program and the Federal junior fellowship program and personnel participating in the worker-traineee opportunity program.

(2) Personnel employed under a part-time career employment program established under section 3402 of title 5, United States Code, shall be counted as prescribed in section 3404 of that title. Personnel employed in an overseas area on a part-time basis under a nonpermanent local-hire appointment who are dependents accompanying a Federal civilian employee or a member of a uniformed service on official assignment or tour of duty shall also be counted as prescribed in section 3404 of that title.

(3) Whenever a function, power or duty, or activity is transferred or assigned to a department or agency of the Department of Defense from a department or agency outside the Department of Defense or from another department or agency within the Department of Defense, the civilian personnel end-strength authorized for such departments or agencies of the Department of Defense affected shall be adjusted to reflect any increase or decreases in civilian personnel required as a result of such transfer or assignment.

(d) When the Secretary of Defense determines that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary of Defense may authorize the employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized by subsection (a), but such additional number may not exceed 2 percent of the total number of civilian personnel authorized for the Department of Defense by subsection (a). The Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Congress of any authorization to increase civilian personnel strength under this subsection.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 801. (a) For fiscal year 1985, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) The Army, 76,920.
(2) The Navy, 69,116.
(3) The Marine Corps, 21,186.
(4) The Air Force, 46,592.
(5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 18,338.
(6) The Army Reserve, 15,994.
(7) The Naval Reserve, 3,389.
(8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,941.
(9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 2,990.
(10) The Air Force Reserve, 2,099.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1985 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles V, VI, and VIII of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS AMENDMENT

SEC. 901. (a) Section 139a of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) 'Major defense acquisition program' means a Department of Defense acquisition program that has a firm program baseline and cost estimate, that has received congressionally approved funding and a Department decision to proceed with full-scale engineering development, that is not a highly sensitive classified program (as determined by the Secretary of Defense) and—

"(A) that is designated by the Secretary of Defense as a major defense acquisition program; or

"(B) that is estimated by the Secretary of Defense to require an eventual total expenditure for research, development, test, and evaluation of more than $200,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1980 constant dollars) or an eventual total expenditure for procurement of more than $1,000,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1980 constant dollars).";

(2) by striking out "appropriated" the first two times it appears in subsection (a) (3);

(3) by inserting "in excess of $5,000,000" between "the program" and "in dollar amount." in subsection (a)(4);

(4) by striking out subsection (b)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) A status report on a major defense acquisition program need not be included in the Selected Acquisition Report for the second, third, or fourth quarter of a fiscal year if such a report was included in a previous Selected Acquisition Report for the fiscal year and during the period since that report there has been:

"(A) Less than a 5% change in total program costs; or

"(B) Less than a 5% change in program performance; or

"(C) Less than a six-month delay in any program schedule milestones.";

(5) by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) Each comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Report shall be submitted within 60 days after the date on which the President transmits the Budget to Congress for the following fiscal year, and each Quarterly Selected Acquisition Report shall be submitted within 45 days after the end of the fiscal-year quarter."; and

(6) by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Reporting on this section shall apply to a major defense acquistion program until 90 percent of planned deliveries have been made or 90 percent of planned expenditures have been incurred.".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1985, and shall apply beginning with respect to reports for the first quarter of fiscal year 1985.

UNIT COST REPORT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 902. (a) Section 139b of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) 'Baseline Selected Acquisition Report', with respect to a unit cost report that is submitted under this section to the Secretary concerned on a major defense acquisition program, means the first comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Report prepared subsequent to the award of the first production contract or the comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Report for the fiscal year immediately before the fiscal year containing the quarter with respect to which the unit cost report is submitted, whichever is later.";

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

"(4) 'Baseline Report', with respect to a unit cost report that is submitted under this section to the Secretary concerned on a major defense acquisition program, means:

"(A) the Baseline Selected Acquisition Report when no report has been submitted under either subsection (e)(1) or (e)(2)(B)(ii) during the second, third, or fourth fiscal-year quarter of the preceding fiscal year; or

"(B) The unit cost report required by subsection (e)(2)(B)(ii) whenever submitted during the second, third, or fourth fiscal-year quarter of the preceding fiscal year; or

"(C) The unit cost report required by subsection (e)(1) whenever submitted during the second, third, or fourth fiscal-year quarter of the preceding fiscal year, and no report has been submitted under subsection (e)(2)(B)(ii) during the same three-quarter period.";

(3) by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The program manager for a defense acquisition program that as of the end of a fiscal-year quarter is a major defense acquisition program (other than a program not required to be included in the Selected Acquisition Report for that quarter under section 139a(b)(3) of this title) shall, after the end of each fiscal-year quarter, submit to the Secretary concerned a written report on the unit costs of the program. Each report for the first quarter of a fiscal year shall be submitted not more than 7 days after the date on which the President transmits the budget to Congress for the following fiscal year. Each report for all other quarters shall be submitted not more than 7 days after the end of that quarter. The program manager shall include in each such unit cost report the following information with respect to the program (as of the last day of the quarter for which the report is made):

"(1) The program acquisition unit cost in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars.

"(2) In the case of a procurement program, the procurement unit cost in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars.

"(3) Any cost variance or schedule variance in a major contract under the program since the Baseline Report was submitted.

"(4) Any changes from program schedule milestones or program performances reflected in the Baseline Selected Acquisition Report that are known, expected, or anticipated by the program manager.";

(4) subsection (c) is amended by—

(A) striking out clauses (1)(A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) that the program acquisition unit cost expressed in constant base-year dollars for the program has increased by more than 15 percent over the program acquisition unit cost for the program as shown in the Baseline Report;".

"(B) in the case of a major defense acquisition program that is a procurement program, that the current procurement unit cost expressed in constant base-year dollars for the program has increased by more than 15 percent over the procurement unit cost for the program as reflected in the Baseline Report; or";

(B) striking out "of" in clause (2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof: "expressed in constant base-year dollars for";

(C) inserting "expressed in constant base-year dollars" immediately before "for the program" in subsection (c)(2)(B);

(5) subsection (d) is amended—

(A) by striking out clauses (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) When a unit cost report is submitted to the Secretary concerned under this section with respect to a major defense acquisition program, the Secretary shall determine whether the current program acquisition unit cost expressed in constant base-year dollars for the program has increased by more than 15 percent, or by more than 25 percent, over the program acquisition unit cost for the program as shown in the Baseline Report.

"(2) When a unit cost report is submitted to the Secretary concerned under this section with respect to a major defense acquisition program that is a procurement program, the Secretary concerned shall, in addition to the determination under paragraph (1), determine whether the current procurement unit cost expressed in constant base-year dollars for the program has increased by more than 15 percent, or by more than 25 percent, over the procurement unit cost for the program as reflected in the Baseline Report.";

(B) by inserting immediately before "has increased" each time it appears in clause (3) the following: "expressed in constant base-year dollars";

(C) by striking out clause (3)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) except as provided in subsection (e), additional military construction; research, development, test, and evaluation; or procurement funds may not be obligated for acquisition contracts for the procurement of facilities, development prototypes, or hardware for such defense acquisition programs—

"(i) after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the day on which the Secretary makes such a determination, in the case of a percentage increase of more than 15 percent; or

"(ii) after the end of the 60-day period beginning on the day on which the Secretary makes such a determination, in the case of a percentage increase of more than 25 percent.";

(6) subsection (e) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(i)" immediately after "(d)(3)(B)"; by inserting "more than" immediately before "15 percent" and by striking out "(g)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(f)" in clause (1);

(B) by inserting "(ii)" immediately before "(d)(3)(B)" and by inserting "more than" immediately before "25 percent" in clause (2);

(C) by striking out clause (2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) if the increase was due to termination or cancellation of the acquisition program or due to changes in the planned program as a result of congressional action, and the Secretary concerned submits to Congress, before the end of the 30-day period referred to in such subsection, a report containing the information described in subsection (f); or";

(D) by striking out "(g)" in clause (2)(B)(ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "(f)"; and

(E) by striking out clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) The prohibition in subsection (d)(3)(B) on the obligation of funds for a major defense acquisition program shall cease to apply when the Secretary concerned submits the report as provided under subsection (e)(1) in the case of a determination of a more than 15 percent increase (as determined under subsection (d), or the Secretary concerned submits the report as provided under subsection (e)(1) and the Secretary of Defense submits the report as provided under subsection (e)(2)(B) in the case of a more than 25 percent increase (as determined under subsection (d)."; (7) by striking out subsection (f);

(8) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f) and by amending subsection (f) as redesignated by this section—

(A) by striking out clause (I) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(I) The type and date of the Baseline Report.";

(B) by striking out clause (K) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(K) The current change and the total change, in dollars and expressed as a percentage, in the procurement unit cost, stated both in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars and the procurement unit cost for the succeeding fiscal year expressed in constant base-year dollars and in current year dollars."; and

(C) by inserting "or due to changes in the planned program as a result of congressional action" immediately after "the entire program" in clause (2).

(9) by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(h) This section shall not apply to major defense acquisition programs until the first quarter of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the first production contract is awarded for the program.".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1985, and shall apply beginning with respect to reports for the first quarter of fiscal year 1985.

NAVY STOCK FUND CREDITS

SEC. 903. Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 2208(g) of title 10, United States Code, withdrawal credits may be issued to customer accounts in connection with the capitalization of aviation depot level repairable assets.

CONTINUED OPERATION BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE OF THE DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION SYSTEM

SEC. 904. (a)(1) Sections 208 and 302, subsection (e) of section 202 and subsection (f) of section 401 of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3418, 3442, 3412(e) and 3461(f)) are repealed.

(2) Section 419(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 3478(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "(1)" after the subsection designation "(a)", and

(B) by striking out paragraph (2).

(3) Section 503(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 3503(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "(1) after the subsection designation "(a)", and

(B) by striking out clause (2).

(4) The table of contents at the beninning of such Act is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 208 and 302.

(5) Section 414(b) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 3474(b)) is amended by striking out "302".

(6) Section 508(f) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 5316) is amended by striking out "(38) Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents, Department of Education".

(b) The second sentence of section 1410(b) of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 928(b)) is amended by striking out "The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Defense".

(c) Section 1402 of the Department of Defense Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921) is amended by inserting the following new subsection:

"(c) The Secretary of Defense, in his discretion, may request the Secretary of Education to provide information, advice and technical support concerning educational programs and practices.".

(d) Section 1411(a) of the Department of Defense Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 929(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established in the Department of Defense an Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Council'). The Council shall be composed of—

"(1) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Assistant Secretary"), who shall be the chairman of the Council;

"(2) twelve individuals appointed by the Assistant Secretary, who shall be individuals who have demonstrated an interest in the field of primary or secondary education and who shall include representatives of professional employee organizations, school administrators, sponsors of students enrolled in the defense dependents' education system, and one student enrolled in such system.

"(3) representatives from overseas military commands and from educational institutions as designated by the Assistant Secretary; and

"(4) one individual appointed by the Secretary of Education. The Director shall be the Executive Secretary of the Council".

(e) Section 1411(b)(1) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 929(b)(1) is amended by striking out "Secretary of Education" and inserting in lieu thereof "Assistant Secretary".

(f) Section 1411(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 929(c) is amended—

(1) by striking out "at least four times each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "not more than four times each year";

(2) by striking out clause (2):

(3) by redesignating clauses (3), (4), and (5) as clauses (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(4) by striking out "Secretary of Education" in clause (4) (as redesignated in clause (3) of this subsection) and inserting in lieu thereof "Assistant Secretary".

RECIPROCAL COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT

SEC. 905. (a) Chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

§ 2401. Reciprocal communications support

"(a) The Secretary of Defense, subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may enter into an agreement with the government of any allied country or with any international organization whereby the United States agrees to provide communications support and related supplies and services to such country or international organization in return for the reciprocal provision to the United States of an equivalent value of communications support and related supplies and services such country or international organization.

"(b) Any agreement entered into under the authority of this section shall require that any accrued credits and liabilities resulting from an unequal exchange of communications support and related supplies and services during the term of such agreement shall be liquidated by direct payment to the party having provided the greater amount of communications support and related supplies and services. Payments received by the United States shall be credited to the appropriation or fund from which such communications support and related supplies and services have been provided.".

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"2401. Reciprocal communications support.".

REPEAL OF PROHIBITION OF CONSOLIDATION OF FUNCTIONS OF MILITARY TRANSPORTATION COMMANDS

SEC. 906. Section 1110 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1983, is repealed.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986".

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons, and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition and for other procurement for the Army.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), shipbuilding and conversion, and other procurement for the Navy.

(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft and missiles and other procurement for the Air Force.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 105. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 in such amounts as may be necessary for the Defense Agencies.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 106. Effective on October 1, 1985, section 103(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1985" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1986".

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 such additional sums as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a);

(2) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs; and

(3) for increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

TITLE IV—WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working-capital funds.

TITLE IV—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 501. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1986, in such numbers as may be necessary.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 601. (a) For fiscal year 1986 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programed to attain an average strength as may be necessary.

(b) The average strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

SEC. 602. (a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 601, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1986, such number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components as may be necessary.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

TITLE VII—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 701. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized a strength in civilian personnel, as of September 30, 1986, of such numbers as may be necessary.

(b) The strength for civilian personnel prescribed in subsection (a) shall be apportioned among the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act on the manner in which the initial allocation of civilian personnel is made among the military departments and the agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) and shall include the rationale for each allocation.

(c)(1) In computing the strength for civilian personnel, there shall be included all direct-hire and indirect-hire civilian personnel employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense (other than those performed by the National Security Agency) whether employed on a full-time, part-time, or intermittent basis, but excluding special employment categories for students and disadvantaged youth such as the stay-in-school campaign, the temporary summer aid program and the Federal junior fellowship program and personnel participating in the worker-trainee opportunity program.

(2) Personnel employed under a part-time career employment program established under section 3402 of title 5, United States Code, shall be counted as prescribed in section 3404 of that title. Personnel employed in an overseas area on a part-time basis under a nonpermanent local-hire appointment who are dependents accompanying a Federal civilian employee or a member of a uniformed service on official assignment or tour of duty shall also be counted as prescribed in section 3404 of that title.

(3) Whenever a function, power or duty, or activity is transferred or assigned to a department or agency of the Department of Defense from a department or agency outside of the Department of Defense or from another department or agency within the Department of Defense, the civilian personnel end-strength authorized for such departments or agencies of the Department of Defense affected shall be adjusted to reflect any increase or decreases in civilian personnel required as a result of such transfer or assignment.

(d) When the Secretary of Defense determines that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary of Defense may authorize the employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized by subsection (a), but such additional number may not exceed 2 percent of the total number of civilian personnel authorized for the Department of Defense by subsection (a). The Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Congress of any authorization to increase civilian personnel strength under this subsection.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 801. (a) For fiscal year 1986, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized an average military training student load as may be necessary.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1985 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles V, VI, and VIII of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations for Fiscal Year 1985, and for other purposes." This legislation is consistent with the Budget of the United States for Fiscal Year 1985. Appropriations in support of Titles I through IX of this legislation are discussed in that Budget.

Titles I, II, III, and IV of this proposal would authorize new construction and family housing support for the Active Forces as follows: $3,687,174,000 for the Department of the Army, $2,509,086,000 for the Department of the Navy, $3,136,742,000 for the Department of the Air Force, and $479,300,000 for the Defense Agencies. Also included in Title I is authorization for construction of production base support at Army Ammunition Facilities. Title V would authorize $296,700,000 for the United States' share of the NATO Infrastructure program.

Title VI contains authorizations for appropriations and recurring administrative provisions applicable to the Military Construction program in accordance with Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. Title VIII contains nonrecurring general provisions.

Title VII, totaling $390,800,000 would authorize construction for the Guard and Reserve Forces as follows: $88,900,000 for the Army National Guard, $70,400,000 for the Army Reserve, $60,800,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, $102,900,000 for the Air National Guard, and $67,800,000 for the Air Force Reserve. These authorizations are in lump sum amounts, and will be utilized in accordance with Chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code.

Title IX provides authorization for fiscal year 1986 to meet the basic requirements of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law No. 93-344).

The projects that would be authorized by this proposal have been reviewed to determine if environmental impact statements are required by Public Law No. 91-190; required environmental statements will be submitted to the Congress by the Military Departments.

Sincerely,

L. NIEDERLEHNER,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985".

TITLE I—ARMY

AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $60,910,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $21,590,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, $31,800,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $4,730,000.
Fort Drum, New York, $4,740,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, $31,390,000.
Fort Irwin, California, $17,920,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, $359,730,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland, $5,900,000.
Fort Ord, California, $14,960,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, $39,250,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, $7,350,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, $33,800,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, $66,450,000.
Presidio of San Francisco, California, $21,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Hawaii, Various, $2,980,000.
Helemano Military Reservation, Hawaii, $4,650,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, $37,070,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $42,400,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $37,650,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, $24,550,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, $17,650,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, $3,300,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, $12,400,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, $24,960,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $14,400,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $11,000,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $1,150,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $6,450,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $6,300,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $2,600,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $27,400,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $6,100,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $700,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL DEVELOPMENT AND READINESS COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $47,600,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $4,500,000.
Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas, $650,000.
Crane Army Ammunition Activity, Indiana, $3,600,000.
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, $15,650,000.
Hawthorne Army Ammunition Plant, Nevada, $3,400,000.
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $7,800,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, $9,780,000.
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, $2,550,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $26,000,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $830,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $1,900,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, $50,900,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $6,900,000.
Sharpe Army Depot, California, $49,000,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $4,150,000.
Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $810,000.
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, $2,250,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $1,300,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $19,840,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $1,900,000.
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, $1,790,000.
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, Louisiana, $1,600,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $2,940,000.
Scranton Army Ammunition Plant, Pennsylvania, $2,050,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $5,670,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, New York, $950,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado, $650,000.
Fort Detrick, Maryland, $18,400,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, $115,000,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, $4,800,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, $570,000.
Oakland Army Base, California, $2,740,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Cold Regions Laboratory, New Hampshire, $3,600,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM COMMAND

Various Locations, $12,800,000.

CLASSIFIED PROJECTS

Various Locations, $3,800,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Japan, $1,900,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Korea, $121,340,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND OVERSEAS

Various locations, $69,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, $322,550,000.
Greece, $9,730,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Johnston Island, $67,000,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND OVERSEAS

Korea, $2,400,000.

FAMILY HOUSING

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Sierra Army Depot, California, one hundred and twenty-five units, $1,253,000.

Sierra Army Depot, California, eighty units, $5,721,000.

Babenhausen, Federal Republic of Germany, one hundred and six units, $8,856,000.

Mainz, Federal Republic of Germany, one hundred and eighty-six units, $18,233,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

Sec. 103. (a) Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $108,822,000, of which $17,546,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, two hundred and six units, $7,746,000.

Fort Hamilton, New York, one hundred and eight units, $3,996,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, $5,670,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $3,490,000.

Camp H. M. Smith, Oahu, Hawaii, $1,910,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $36,370,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $54,580,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $14,810,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $17,610,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $16,540,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $340,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $11,220,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, $3,710,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, $18,570,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $15,050,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $7,830,000.

Marine Barracks, Washington, District of Columbia, $2,540,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $14,090,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $31,650,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $1,960,000.

Naval Safety Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,640,000.

Naval Regional Data Automation Center, San Diego, California, $15,700,000.

Personnel Support Activity, Washington, District of Columbia, $250,000.

Commandant Naval District Washington, District of Colmbia, $19,750,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick Maine, $2,510,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $5,630,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $7,400,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $27,920,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $9,940,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $23,000,000.

Atlantic Fleet Headquarters Support Activity, Norfolk, Virginia, $24,700,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia $3,600,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $30,615,000.

Personnel Support Activity, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,470,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, $11,265,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $3,900,000.

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, $5,140,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $5,810,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $440,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii, $6,630,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $8,740,000.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California, $1,700,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $4,740,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, $580,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $1,100,000.

Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity, Long Beach, California, $11,700,000.

Naval Magazine, Lualualei, Hawaii, $3,130,000.

Naval Station, Mare Island, Vallejo, California, $1,090,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $3,460,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, $6,370,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, $6,380,000.

Commander, Oceanographic System Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $17,000,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $545,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $18,815,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, $17,300,000.

Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $28,850,000.

Personnel Support Activity, San Diego, California, $2,270,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, California, $17,600,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $27,880,000.

NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarine Training Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $710,000.

Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, $3,315,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $4,675,000.

Personnel Support Activity, Corpus Christi, Texas, $710,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $11,950,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, $1,470,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia, $725,000.

Fleet Training Center, Mayport, Florida, $6,510,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $10,360,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $5,360,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $4,450,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $3,720,000.

Naval Diving and Salvage Training Center, Panama City, Florida, $1,250,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, $1,410,000.

Personnel Support Activity, Pensacola, Florida, $2,510,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,580,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $6,470,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $5,250,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $8,300,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $1,850,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Hospital, Bremerton, Washington, $6,220,000.

Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $970,000.

Naval Hospital, Camp Pendleton, California, $1,410,000.

Naval Hospital, Millington, Tennessee, $410,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California, $29,140,000.

Naval Hospital, Orlando, Florida, $1,760,000.

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia, $410,000.

NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, $3,820,000.

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $6,160,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $5,630,000.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, $570,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina $1,630,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $630,000.

Naval Surface Weapons Center, Dahlgren, Virginia, $4,980,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $2,740,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfsport, Mississippi, $20,815,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,410,000.

Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,270,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $231,960,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $3,010,000.

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $16,270,000.

Naval Underwater Systems Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $24,840,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,000,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $1,420,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $11,330,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $4,050,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, $560,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $9,510,000.

Naval Training Equipment Center, Orlando, Florida, $23,500,000.

Navy Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, $4,620,000.

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $6,680,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $5,270,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Pensacola, Florida, $5,190,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $7,830,000.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, $3,890,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $21,030,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Support Activity, San Diego, California, $11,250,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $4,150,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, $4,870,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Francisco, California, $13,420,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity, St. Inigoes, Maryland, $2,110,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, $2,290,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, $1,140,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Oceanographic Office, Bay St. Louis, Mississippi $1,570,000.

Naval Oceanographic Command, Bay St. Louis, Mississippi $375,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia, $1,160,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $320,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest Chesapeake, Virginia $4,600,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, $220,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan, $6,820,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Butler, Okinawa, Japan $2,330,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba $6,480,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $36,720,000.

Naval Facility, Keflavik, Iceland, $2,620,000.

Naval Station, Panama Canal, Panama, $1,580,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $2,550,000.

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $600,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, $24,260,000.

Navy Support Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $6,425,000.

Naval Air Station, Guam, Mariana Islands, $300,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands, $2,340,000.

Naval Air Facility, Misawa, Japan, $9,300,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $6,520,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $710,000.

Fleet Activities, Yokosuka, Japan, $990,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, NAVAL FORCES, EUROPE

Fleet Operations Control Center Europe, London, England, $2,620,000.

Naval Activities, London, England, $6,620,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain, $25,020,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $20,110,000.

NAVAL MATERIAL COMMAND

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands, $230,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Hospital, Rota, Spain, $18,400,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station Western Pacific, Guam, Mariana Islands, $3,210,000.

Naval Communication Station, Nea Makri, Greece, $3,950,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines, $300,000.

Naval Communication Station, Yokosuka, Japan, $980,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Detachment, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $380,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, $340,000.

Naval Security Group Detachment, Guam, Mariana Islands, $320,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various Locations, $2,790,000.

SANTA MARGARITA WATER PROJECT

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may carry out a military construction project in the amount of $142,000,000 for water supply and flood control of the Santa Margarita River, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California.

FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amounts shown, for each installation:

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, four hundred and five units, $61,107,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, three hundred and sixty units, $26,004,000.

AEGIS Communications System Center, Wallops Island, Virginia, twenty-eight units, $2,400,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, one hundred units, $12,430,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 204. (a) Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $9,000,000.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installation, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown:

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, two hundred and sixty-eight units, $13,300,000.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $49,433,000.
McClellan Air Force Base, California, $13,501,000.
Newark Air Force Station, Ohio, $840,000.
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $18,390,000.
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $27,199,000.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $36,350,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tennessee, $7,700,000.
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $4,450,000.
Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, Florida, $2,750,000.
Edwards Air Force Base, California, $18,180,000.
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $2,680,000.
Various Locations, Florida, $6,300,000.
Goddard Space Flight Center, Maryland, $3,500,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $5,200,000.
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, $910,000.
Various Locations, $1,200,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Base 10, Classified Location, $2,150,000.
Otis Air National Guard Base, Massachusetts, $810,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $11,350,000.
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $17,150,000.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $13,555,000.
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $9,290,000.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $7,400,000.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, $3,820,000.
Mather Air Force Base, California, $3,500,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $9,740,000.
Reese Air Force Base, Texas, $4,900,000.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, $6,300,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $2,500,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $9,500,000.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $480,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Burnt Mountain Air Force Station, Alaska, $1,400,000.
Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $24,850,000.
Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $12,313,000.
Galena Airport, Alaska, $11,800,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $960,000.
Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $14,840,000.
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Florida, $7,830,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $1,500,000.
Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas, $1,890,000.
McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $3,190,000.
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $440,000.
Norton Air Force Base, California, $6,650,000.
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $710,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $19,400,000.
Travis Air Force Base, California, $204,890,000.

NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND CENTER

Pentagon, Virginia, $4,750,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $3,800,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Clear Air Force Station, Alaska, $4,400,000.
Falcon Air Force Station, Colorado, $3,000,000.
Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $25,000,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $53,700,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, $26,995,000.
Base 4, Classified Location, $14,000,000.
Base 17, Classified Location, $45,740,000.
Beale Air Force Base, California, $2,675,000.
Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $2,640,000.
Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, $24,650,000.
Castle Air Force Base, California, $4,100,000.
Conrad Air Station, Montana; $4,260,000.
Dickinson Air Station, North Dakota, $3,710,000.
Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $58,610,000.
F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $49,220,000.
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, $11,500,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $4,420,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $3,400,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $920,000.
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $2,350,000.
Loring Air Force Base, Maine, $31,370,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $1,500,000.
March Air Force Base, California, $9,150,000.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $13,060,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $47,100,000.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $5,950,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $3,650,000.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $34,910,000.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $4,320,000.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $1,125,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Base 16, Classified Location, $11,000,000.
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $10,900,000.
Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, $1,100,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $12,400,000.
England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $5,250,000.
George Air Force Base, California, $17,930,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $8,810,000.
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $2,950,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $29,030,000.
Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $13,660,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $6,120,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $2,030,000.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $1,490,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $2,795,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $12,390,000.
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $9,490,000.
Shaw Air Force, South Carolina, $4,970,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $4,330,000.
Classified Location, $18,000,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, $23,805,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Lajes Field, Portugal, $4,550,000.
Sidi Slimane, Morocco, $2,050,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $2,940,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Kadena Air Base, Japan, $20,680,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $20,000,000.
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $3,000,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Korea, $12,853,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $12,300,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $4,460,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $35,690,000.
Sachon Air Base, $1,100,000.
Suwon Air Base, Korea, $4,090,000.
Taegu Air Base, Korea, $5,950,000.

Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $16,100,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $42,425,000.
Base 11, Classified Location, $6,100,000.
Base 14, Classified Location, $1,700,000.
Wake Island Airfield, Wake Island, $1,235,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Thule Air Base, Greenland, $25,000,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, $13,342,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Palmerola Air Base, Honduras, $1,500,000.
Howard Air Force Base, Panama, $360,000.
Oman, Various Locations, $42,000,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes, Belgium, $4,640,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $5,310,000.
Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands, $81,650,000.
Alzey Radar Site, Germany, $3,150,000.
Bitburg Air Base, Germany $8,910,000.
Classified Location, Germany, $600,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $14,600,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $4,150,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $8,650,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $620,000.
Wenigerath Air Base, Germany, $3,065,000.
Wiesbaden Air Base, Germany, $650,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $4,055,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $1,600,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $6,075,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $2,250,000.
Torrejon Air Base, Spain, $13,350,000.
Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, $1,100,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $1,100,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $9,780,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $5,510,000.
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $3,550,000.
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $12,000,000.
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $2,100,000.
RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $14,100,000.
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $5,210,000.
RAF Welford, United Kingdom, $740,000.
RAF Wethersfield, United Kingdom, $4,300,000.
RAF Woodbridge, United Kingdom, $2,050,000.
RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $15,004,000.
Base 13, Classified Location, $2,050,000.
Base 19, Classified Location, $2,850,000.
Classified Locations, $9,950,000.
Various Locations, Europe, $16,400,000.

FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort MacArthur, California, one hundred and forty units, $16,500,000.

Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, Trailer Park Expansion, $500,000.

Conrad Air Force Station, Montana, forty units, $3,705,000.

F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, two hundred sixty-five units, $17,343,000.

Florennes, Belgium, four hundred units, $37,509,000.

Comiso, Italy, five hundred seventy-six units, $50,070,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, utilities expansion, $2,700,000.

RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, two hundred and fifty units, $22,441,000.

RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, three hundred units, $27,410,000.

RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, two hundred units, $21,963,000.

Classified Location, Federal Republic of Germany, two hundred and fifty units, $24,086,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 303. (a) Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $62,173,000, of which $23,751,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred and fifty-six units, $4,642,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, one hundred and six units, $2,772,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, two hundred and fifty units, $8,820,000.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Fuel Support Point, Adak, Alaska, $6,730,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Whittier, Alaska, $12,170,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Fairbanks, Alaska, $1,800,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, San Diego, Imperial Beach, California, $900,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Hawaii, $1,950,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Grand Forks, North Dakota, $475,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Cincinnati, Ohio, $2,600,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $18,000,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Mukilteo, Washington, $500,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Hydrographic/Topographic Center, Brookmont, Maryland, $20,100,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $34,300,000.

Rosman, North Carolina, $500,000.

Baltimore, Maryland, $7,500,000.

Classified Location, $500,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Presidio of Monterey, California, $22,475,000.

National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, $5,022,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, $9,000,000.

Classified Activity, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $28,400,000.

Classified Location, $5,900,000.

DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE

Fort Holabird, Maryland, $220,000.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Fort McClellan, Alabama, $1,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $1,700,000.

Fort Benning, Georgia, $5,600,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $7,500,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky, $21,961,000.

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, $3,650,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $5,600,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, $7,372,000.

Outside the United States

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Fuel Support Point, Pohang, Korea, $15,800,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $10,675,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $12,900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Classified Locations, $5,200,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $10,100,000.
Amberg, Germany, $1,860,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $3,660,000.
Bad Nauheim, Germany, $1,200,000.
Bindlach, Germany, $1,750,000.
Crailsheim, Germany, $1,660,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $11,620,000.
Germersheim, Germany, $1,680,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $2,060,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $2,840,000.
Katterbach, Germany, $3,780,000.
Ludwigsburg, Germany, $2,110,000.
Mannheim, Germany, $3,780,000.
Neubrueke, Germany, $2,700,000.
Osterholz-Scharmbeck, Germany, $940,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $2,120,000.
Ulm, Germany, $2,970,000.
Wiesbaden, Germany, $830,000.
Wertheim, Germany, $2,080,000.
Worms, Germany, $2,230,000.
Wuerzberg, Germany, $2,650,000.
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $3,440,000.
Comiso, Italy, $13,600,000.
Camp Kinser, Japan, $5,410,000.
Camp McTureous, Japan, $6,520,000.
Zukeran, Japan, $2,820,000.
Seoul, Korea, $1,410,000.
Brunssum, Netherlands, $2,650,000.
Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $3,500,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $5,920,000.
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $1,010,000.
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $13,600,000.
RAF High Wycombe, United Kingdom, $6,270,000.
RAF Woodbridge, United Kingdom, $1,730,000.

FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Classified Locations, six units, $693,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 403. Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $107,000.

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 404. Section 604(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Pub. L. No. 98-115, 97 Stat. 779), is amended by deleting the phrases "$306,386,000" and "$90,572,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrases "$321,386,000" and '$105,572,000", respectively.

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 605.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 601. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,687,174,000 as follows:

(1) For projects authorized by section 101 that are to be carried out inside the United States, $1,444,100,000.

(2) For projects authorized by section 101 that are to be carried out outside the United States, $594,120,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $33,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $190,000,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $500,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $156,800,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing, $1,268,654,000, of which not more than $129,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $107,249,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsections (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY

SEC. 602. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,509,086,000 as follows:

(1) For projects authorized by section 201 that are to be carried out inside the United States, $1,262,485,000.

(2) For projects authorized by section 201 that are to be carried out outside the United States, $195,815,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $19,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $157,900,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(6) For the Santa Margarita Water Project authorized by section 202 that is to be carried out inside the United States, $142,000,000.

(7) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $119,500,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing, $608,386,000, of which not more than $28,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $20,052,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsections (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 603. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $3,136,742,000 as follows:

(1) For projects authorized by section 301 that are to be carried out inside the United States, $1,318,116,000.

(2) For projects authorized by section 301 that are to be carried out outside the United States, $550,544,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $21,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $163,900,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $24,550,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and aquisition of military family housing and facilities, $292,400,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing, $766,232,000, of which not more than $57,239,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsections (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 604. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $479,300,000 as follows:

(1) For projects authorized by section 401 that are to be carried out inside the United States, $233,425,000.

(2) For projects authorized by section 401 that are to be carried out outside the United States, $177,075,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(4) For construction projects under the contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $15,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $30,000,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $800,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing, $19,000,000, of which not more than $15,773,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsections (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO

SEC. 605. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program, as authorized by Title V, $296,700,000.

ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 606 (a) Amounts authorized under sections 601 through 604 for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities include amounts for minor construction, improvements to existing military family housing units and facilities, relocation of military family housing units under section 2827 of title 10, United States Code, and architectural and engineering services and construction design.

(b) Amounts authorized under sections 601 through 604 for support of military family housing include amounts for operating expenses, leasing expenses, maintenance of real property expenses, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, and payments of mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m).

EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS: EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 607. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure program, (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1986, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure program, (and authorizations of appropriations therefore), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1986, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later, for construction contracts, and acquisition, family housing projects, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure program.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 606(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983 (Pub. L. No. 97-321, 96 Stat. 1567), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, and 301 of such Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1985, or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986, whichever is later:

(1) Consolidated Heating Facility in the amount of $1,300,000 at Giessen, Germany.

(2) Barracks in the amount of $9,300,000 at Vilseck, Germany.

(3) Battalion Headquarters and Classroom in the amount of $3,000,000 at Vilseck Germany.

(4) Dining Facility in the amount of $3,600,000 at Vilseck, Germany.

(5) Barracks in the amount of $10,600,000 at Vilseck, Germany.

(6) Standby Generator Plant in the amount of $4,500,000 at the Naval Communications Area Master Station Eastern Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii.

(7) Rapid Deployment Force Facilities in the amount of $55,000,000 at Ras Banas Egypt.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW

SEC. 608. For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1, 1984, whichever is later, and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 or October 1, 1985, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $1,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000.

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $6,000.

(5) (A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is 31,000.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 609. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1984.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

AUTHORIZATION FOR FACILITIES

SEC. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1984, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under Chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States $88,900,000, and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $70,400,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $60,800,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States $102,900,000, and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $67,800,000.

MODIFICATION OF GUARD AND RESERVE MINOR CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 702. Subsection 2233a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting the phrase "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "$100,000".

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION FOR CONSTRUCTION TO UPGRADE CRITICAL PORTIONS OF ARMORIES

SEC. 703. Subsection 2233(a)(6) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting the phrases "arms storage rooms" and "standards related to the safekeeping of arms" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrases "critical portions of facilities" and "construction criteria or standard related to the execution of the Federal military mission assigned to the unit utilizing the facility", respectively.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

OCCUPANT LIABILITY

SEC. 801. (a) section 2775 of Title 10, United States Code, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

§ 2775. Liability of member for damages to housing, equipment, and furnishings.

"(a) A member of the Armed Forces shall be liable to the United States for damage to any family or unaccompanied personnel housing unit, or damage to or loss of any equipment or furnishings of any family or unaccompanied personnel housing unit, assigned or provided to such member if it is determined, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, that such damage or loss was caused by the abuse or negligence of such member, any dependent of such member, or their guests.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense may establish limitations of liability or compromise or waive a claim under this section.

"(c) (1) The Secretary concerned may deduct from a member's pay, or provide for the collection by means other than the checkage or pay, an amount sufficient to pay for the cost of the repair or replacement made necessary as the result of any abuse or negligence referred to in subsection (a) on the part of such member, any dependent of such member, or their guests.

"(2) The final determination of an amount to be deducted from the pay of an officer of an Armed Force in accordance with regulations issued under this section shall be deemed to be a special order authorizing such deduction for the purposes of section 1007 of title 37.

"(d) Amounts deducted from a member's pay under this section, or any other amounts collected, shall be credited to the family housing operations and maintenance account, or the operations and maintenance account of the military department or defense agency concerned and shall be available for use for the same purposes and under the same circumstances as other funds in such accounts.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall issue regulations to carry out the provisions of this section, including regulations for determining the cost of repairs or replacements made necessary as the result of abuse or negligence on the part of a member, dependent of a member, or their guests, and regulations providing for limitations liability, the compromise or waiver of a claim, and collection by means other than the checkage of pay."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of Chapter 165 is amended by amending the item referring to section 2775 to read as follows:

"§ 2775. Liability of member for damages to housing, equipment, and furnishings."

OCCUPANCY OF SUBSTANDARD FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 802. Subsection 2830(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof: "(2) Occupancy of a family housing unit under paragraph (1) shall subject such member to a charge equal to 75 percent of the member's basic allowance for quarters."

ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY; COST VARIATIONS

SEC. 803. Section 2676 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—(1) by inserting in subsection (c)(2) the phrase ", or for condemnation actions, the amount to be deposited with the court as just compensation for the land" immediately after the phrase "upon the agreed price for the land", (2) by inserting in subsection (c)(2)(B) the phrase ", or for condemnation actions, the amount to be deposited with the court as just compensation for the land," immediately after the phrase "the agreed price for the land," and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding the foregoing, deficiency judgments awarded by a court in condemnation actions, or resulting from a final settlement of a condemnation action, shall be paid promptly from funds available for land acquisition projects.".

ACQUISITION OF OPTIONS ON PROPERTY

Sec. 804. Subsection 2677(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by deleting the number "5" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "12".

RESTORATION OF PERMITTED LAND

Sec. 805. (a) Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2691. Restoration of Permitted Land

"The Secretary of the Military Department concerned is authorized, from funds available for operations and maintenance or construction, to remove improvements, clear, reseed, and replant the site, and to take any other action necessary in his judgment to restore land permitted to his department by another military department or Federal agency when required by the terms of the permit making such land available. Unless otherwise prohibited by law or the terms of the permit, such land shall first be screened with other military departments and Federal agencies for re-use in its improved state, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, prior to commencing restoration. Maintenance and repair of the improvements, to the standards established for excess property by the General Services Administration may continue during the screening process."

(b) the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof, the following new item:

"2691, Restoration of Permitted Land"

LAND EXCHANGE FOR CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER

Sec. 806. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to acquire title to, or easements or rights-of-way over, lands in the vicinity of the Consolidated Space Operations Center, Falcon Air Force Station, Colorado. Such lands or interests therein shall be acquired by exchanging land at the former Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colorado, or other Federal lands in Colorado, with the State of Colorado Board of Land Commissioners. Conveyance of lands at the former Ent AFB to the State shall be subject to the existing lease to the U.S. Olympic Committee, Inc.

(b) The Secretary shall adjust the amount of land and the nature of the interests acquired so that the fair market value of the lands conveyed and received, as determined by the Secretary, are substantially equal.

(c) The exact acreages to be acquired or conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys which are satisfactory to the

Secretary. The cost of any such surveys shall be borne by the Air Force.

(d) The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transaction authorized by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

PREMOBILIZATION AUTHORITY

SEC. 807. Section 2808 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows: (1) by inserting in the first sentence of subsection (a), immediately after the phrase "requires use of the Armed Forces," the phrase "or when the President determines that there is an imminent threat to the national security of such a nature that existing facilities would be inadequate to meet a mobilization effort," and (2) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following sentence: "With respect to a Presidential determination of an imminent threat to the national security of such a nature that existing facilities are inadequate to meet a mobilization effort, the authority described in subsection (a) shall terminate six months after such determination unless the President issues a declaration of national emergency or war is declared, in which case the authority described in subsection (a) shall terminate at the end of the war or national emergency."

AUTHORIZED COST VARIATIONS

SEC. 808. Subsection 2853(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the phrase "is more than the amount specified by law as the maximum amount for a minor military construction project and" after the phrase "under the contract".

EXPEDITING CONTINGENCY AND EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 809. Subchapter I of Chapter 169, of title 10, United States Code, is hereby amended by (1) inserting in the first sentence of subsection 2803(b) the phrase ", prior to the obligation of funds for such project," immediately after the word "shall" and deleting the last sentence of such subsection, and (2) inserting in the first sentence of subsection 2804(b), the phrase ", prior to the obligation of funds for such project," immediately after the word "shall" and deleting the last sentence of such subsection.

TITLE IX

SEC. 901. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 such sums as may be necessary for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is proposed legislation "[t]o authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes." This bill would authorize specific appropriations for fiscal year 1985 and those appropriations which might be necessary for fiscal year 1986. The total amount proposed in title I for fiscal year 1985 is $7,785,575,000 of which $5,941,144,000 is for operating expenses, $464,981,000 is for capital equipment, and $1,379,450,000 is for construction projects.

Title II sets forth general provisions that would govern reprograming of funds, general plant projects, construction projects, fund transfers, construction designs, availability of funds, and pay cost adjustments.

Section 210 would clarify the status of certain contractors that operate or operated Government-owned facilities relating to atomic energy national defense actvities and are in litigation arising from those activities. Recently many suits have been brought against those contractors, alleging that exposure to radiation from the United States atomic weapons testing program resulted in personal injury or death.

Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), the United States is not liable and cannot be sued for acts of independent contractors providing goods or services to the United States. The contractors operating nuclear weapons testing facilities for the Department of Energy or its predecessor agencies, or those participating in the atomic weapons testing program, however, are unique. They are not typical of contract suppliers of commercially provided goods or services. Only the Government sets the policy, makes the decisions, and controls activities and circumstances regarding atomic weapons research, development, and testing. Consequently, these contractors were utilized by the United States as instruments of national policy to assist in this entirely governmental task.

Furthermore, the Government reimburses these contractors for any liability arising out of their assistance in the weapons program, including the costs of litigation. Accordingly, section 210 would cause all litigation involving the atomic weapons testing program, including suits now filed against contractors, to be maintained against the United States under the substantive and procedural requirements of the FTCA.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of this legislative proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

THEODORE J. GARRISH,
General Counsel.

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Security Programs Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1985 and 1986."

TITLE I—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

SEC. 101. Funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1985 for operating expenses incurred in carrying out national security programs (including scientific research and development in support of the armed forces, strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense, and military applications of nuclear energy and related management and support activities) as follows:

(1) For naval reactors development, $426,400,000.
(2) For weapons activities, $3,496,754,000.
(3) For verification and control technology, $73,700,000.
(4) For materials production, $1,493,590,000.
(5) For defense waste and byproducts management, $358,700,000.
(6) For nuclear safeguards and security, $58,000,000.
(7) For security investigations, $34,000,000.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

SEC. 102. Funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1985 for plant and capital equipment (including planning, construction, acquisition, and modificiation of facilities, land acquisition related thereto, and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction) necessary for national security programs as follows:

(1) For naval reactors development:

Project 85-N-101, general plant projects, various locations, $2,000,000.

Project 82-N-111, materials facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $40,000,000, for a total project authorization of $165,000,000.

Project 81-T-112, modifications and additions to prototype facilities, various locations, $6,000,000, for a total project authorization of $110,000,000.

(2) For weapons activities:

Project 85-D-101, general plant projects, various locations, $31,600,000.

Project 85-D-111, general plant projects, various locations, $32,200,000.

Project 85-D-102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, Phase I, various locations, $56,600,000.

Project 85-D-103, safeguards and security enhancements, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and

Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, $4,700,000.

Project 85-D-104, test devices assembly building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $800,000.

Project 85-D-105, combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, Nevada, $3,000,000.

Project 85-D-106, hardened radiography facility, Site 300, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $800,000.

Project 85-D-112, enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $4,500,000.

Project 85-D-113, power plant and steam distribution system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $4,500,000.

Project 85-D-114, safeguards vaults, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $3,100,000.

Project 85-D-115, renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $5,800,000.

Project 85-D-121, air and water pollution control facilities, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $5,000,000.

Project 85-D-122, safeguards and site security upgrade, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, Ohio, $2,700,000.

Project 85-D-123, safeguards and site security upgrade, Phase I, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $1,000,000.

Project 85-D-124, safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $1,000,000.

Project 85-D-125, tactical bomb production facilities, various locations, $10,000,000.

Project 84-D-102, radiation-hardened integrated circuit laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $20,000,000, for a total project authorization of $22,000,000.

Project 84-D-103, hardened central guard force facility, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $5,600,000, for a total project authorization of $6,200,000.

Project 84-D-104, nuclear materials storage facility, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $6,500,000, for a total project authorization of $7,200,000.

Project 84-D-105, safeguards and security upgrades, Phase I, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $10,100,000, for a total project authorization of $15,100,000.

Project 84-D-106, security system upgrade, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $2,300,000, for a total project authorization of $3,800,000.

Project 84-D-107, nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations, $34,900,000, for a total project authorization of $58,400,000.

Project 84-D-112, Trident II warhead production facilities, various locations, $60,700,000, for a total project authorization of $80,000,000.

Project 84-D-113, antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead production facilities, various locations, $15,000,000.

Project 84-D-114, consolidated manufacturing facility, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $21,100,000, for a total project authorization of $45,200,000.

Project 84-D-115, electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $10,000,000, for a total project authorization of $11,500,000.

Project 84-D-117, inert assembly and test facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $11,700,000, for a total project authorization of $13,200,000.

Project 84-D-118, high-explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $40,000,000, for a total project authorization of $47,000,000.

Project 84-D-119, railroad track replacement and upgrade Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $6,800,000, for a total project authorization of $7,600,000.

Project 84-D-120, explosive component test facility, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, Ohio, $16,900,000, for a total project authorization of $20,000,000.

Project 84-D-121, safeguards and site security upgrading, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $11,200,000, for a total project authorization of $21,200,000.

Project 84-D-124, environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $21,400,000, for a total project authorization of $29,000,000.

Project 84-D-211, safeguards and site security upgrading Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $8,000,000, for a total project authorization of $15,500,000.

Project 84-D-212, safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, Florida, $2,700,000, for a total project authorization of $3,700,000.

Project 83-D-124, standard missile-2 (SM-2) warhead production facilities, various locations, $9,000,000, for a total project authorization of $11,000,000.

Project 83-D-199, buffer land acquisition, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, $17,000,000, for a total project authorization of $24,000,000.

Project 82-D-107, utilities and equipment restoration replacement, and upgrade, Phase III, various locations, $175,100,000, for a total project authorization of $580,500,000.

Project 82-D-111, interactive graphics systems, various locations, $6,800,000, for a total project authorization of $20,000,000.

Project 82-D-144, simulation technology laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $16,500,000, for a total project authorization of $28,700,000.

Project 82-D-146, weapons production and production support facilities, various locations, $10,000,000, for a total project authorization of $60,030,000.

Project 82-D-150, weapons materials research and development facility, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $16,800,000 for a total project authorization of $27,200,000.

Project 81-D-101, particle beam fusion accelerator-II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $3,500,000, for a total project authorization of $45,650,000.

Project 81-D-115, Missile X warhead production facilties, various locations, $20,900,000, for a total project authorization of $125,000,000.

Project 81-D-120, control of effluents and pollutants, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $1,400,000, for a total project authorization of $7,800,000.

Project 81-D-134, earthquake damage restoration, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, $4,900,000, for a total project authorization of $8,600,000.

Project 79-7-0, universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $3,800,000, for a total project authorization of $15,900,000.

(3) For verification and control technology:

Project 85-D-171, space science laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $1,000,000.

(4) For materials production:

Project 85-D-131, general plant projects, various locations, $32,000,000.

Project 85-D-132, plant engineering and design, various locations, $2,000,000.

Project 85-D-136, components protection system, 100-N area, Richland, Washington, $3,300,000.

Project 85-D-137, vault safety special nuclear material inventory system, Richland, Washington, $2,500,000,

Project 85-D-139, fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuels Processing Facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $10,000,000.

Project 85-D-140, productivity and radiological improvements, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $6,000,000.

Project 85-D-142, U_3O_8 fuel tube facilities, fuel preparation area, Savannah River, South Carolina, $8,000,000.

Project 85-D-145, uranyl nitrate to oxide conversion facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $1,800,000.

Project 84-D-130, modification processing facility substations, Savannah River, South Carolina, $200,000, for a total project authorization of $5,800,000.

Project 84-D-134, safequards and security improvements, Plantwide, Savannah River, South Carolina, $14,900,000, for a total project authorization of $26,900,000.

Project 84-D-136, enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $8,000,000 for a total project authorization of $12,400,000.

Project 84-D-137, facility security systems upgrade, Idaho Fuels Processing Facility (IFPF), Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $8,000,000, for a total project authorization of $10,000,000.

Project 83-D-146, water pollution control, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $4,100,000, for a total project authorization of $9,500,000.

Project 83-D-147, pollution discharge elimination, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,150,000, for a total project authorization of $8,650,000.

Project 83-D-148, non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, South Carolina, $11,500,000, for a total project authorizationof $19,000,000.

Project 83-D-180, facility storage modifications, various locations, $6,500,000,, for a total project authorization of $15,800,000.

Project 82-D-124, restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV and V, various locations, $72,800,000, for a total project authorization of $304,634,000.

Project 82-D-128, plant perimeter security systems upgrade, Idaho Fuels Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $400,000, for a total project authorization of $5,400,000.

Project 82-D-136, fuel processing facilites upgrade, Idaho Fuels Processing Facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $1,000,000, for a total project authorization of $46,000,000.

Project 82-D-201, special plutonium recovery facilities, JB-Line, Savannah River, South Carolina, $28,800,000, for a total project authorization of $65,800,000.

(5) For defense waste and byproducts management:

Project 85-D-156, general plant projects, interim waste operations and long-term waste management technology, various locations, $25,645,000.

Project 85-D-157, seventh calcined solids storage facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $7,000,000.

Project 85-D-158, central warehouse upgrade, Richland, Washington, $700,000.

Project 85-D-159, new waste transfer facilities, H Area, Savannah River, South Carolina, $11,000,000.

Project 85-D-160, test reactor area security system upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho, $2,000,000.

Project 83-D-157, additional radioactive waste storage facilities, Richland, Washington, $3,155,000, for a total project authorization of $53,155,000.

Project 81-T-105, defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $238,000,000, for a total project authorization of $440,000,000.

Project 77-13-f, waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, New Mexico, $61,100,000, for a total project authorization of $404,200,000.

(6) For capital equipment not related to construction—

(A) for naval reactors development, $22,500,000;

(B) for weapons activities, $271,350,000;

(C) for verification and control technology $2,000,000;

(D) for materials production, $128,660,000;

(E) for defense waste and byproducts management, $35,771,000; and,

(F) for nuclear safeguards and security $4,700,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPROGRAMING

SEC. 201. Except as otherwise provided in this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of 105 percent of the amount authorized for that program by this Act or $10,000,000 more than the amount authorized for that program by this Act, whichever is the lesser, and

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to, or requested of, the Congress, unless the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") transmits to the appropriate committees of Congress a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken with respect to the program and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed action.

LIMITS ON GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary may carry out any construction project under the general plant projects provisions authorized by this Act if the total estimated cost of the construction project does not exceed $1,200,000.

(b) If at any time during the construction of any general plant project authorized by this Act, the estimated cost of the project is revised because of unforeseen cost variations and the revised cost of the project exceeds $1,200,000, the Secretary shall immediately furnish a complete report to the appropriate committees of Congress explaining the reasons for the cost variation.

LIMITS ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the current estimated cost of a construction project which is authorized by section 102 of this Act, or which is in support of national security programs of the Department of Energy and was authorized by any previous Act, exceeds by more than 25 percent the higher of (1) the amount authorized for the project, or (2) the amount of the total estimated cost for the project as shown in the most recent budget justification data submitted to Congress, construction may not be started or additional obligations incurred in connection with the project above the total estimated cost, as the case may be, unless a period of thirty calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) has passed after receipt by the appropriate committees of the Congress of written notice from the Secretary containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the action.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any construction project which has a current estimated cost of less than $5,000,000.

FUND TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC. 204. To the extent specified in appropriation Acts, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be transferred to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which the funds were appropriated, and funds so transferred may be merged with the appropriations of the agency to which the funds are transferred.

AUTHORITY FOR CONSTRUCTION DESIGN

SEC. 205. (a) Within the amounts authorized by this Act for plant engineering and design, the Secretary may carry out advance planning and construction designs (including architectural and engineering services) in connection with any proposed construction project.

(b) In any case in which the total estimated cost for such planning and design exceeds $1,000,000, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress in writing of the details of the project at least thirty days before any funds are obligated for design service for the project.

AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION DESIGN

SEC. 206. In addition to the advance planning and construction design authorized by section 102, the Secretary may perform planning and design utilizing available funds for any Department of Energy national security program construction project whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously in order to meet the needs of national defense or to protect property or human life.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALL NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 207. Subject to the provisions of appropriation Acts, amounts appropriated pursuant to this Act for management and support activities and for general plant projects are available for use, when necessary, in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

ADJUSTMENTS FOR PAY INCREASES

SEC. 208. Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement or other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such amounts as may be necessary for increases in benefits authorized by law.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 209. When so specified in an appropriation Act, amounts appropriated for "Operating Expenses" or for "Plant and Capital Equipment" may remain available until expended.

CONTRACTOR LIABILITY FOR INJURY OR LOSS OF PROPERTY ARISING OUT OF ATOMIC WEAPONS TESTING PROGRAMS

SEC. 210. (a) The remedy against the United States provided by sections 1346(b) and 2672 of title 28, United States Code, or by sections 741–752 or 781–790 of title 46, United States Code, as appropriate, for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death shall apply to any civil action for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death due to exposure to radiation based on acts or omissions by a contractor in carrying out a contract in the conduct of the United States atomic weapons testing program. This remedy shall be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding for the purpose of determining civil liability arising from any act or omission of the contractor without regard to when the act or omission occurred. The employees of such a contractor shall be considered to be employees of the Federal Government, as provided in section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, for the purposes of any such civil action or proceeding and the civil action or proceeding shall proceed in the same manner as any action against the United States filed pursuant to section 1346(b) of such title and shall be subject to the limitations and exceptions applicable to those actions.

(b) A contractor against whom a civil action or proceeding described in subsection (a) is brought shall promptly deliver all processes served upon that contractor to the Attorney General of the United States. Upon certification by the Attorney General that the suit against the contractor is within the provisions of subsection (a), a civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceedings shall be deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of section 1346(b), 2401(b), or 2402, or sections 2671 through 2680 of title 28, United States Code. For purposes of removal, the certification by the Attorney General under this subsection establishes contractor status conclusively.

(c) The provisions of this section shall apply to any action now pending or hereafter commenced which is an action within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. Notwithstanding section 2401(b) of title 28, United States Code, if a civil action or proceeding pending on the date of enactment of this section is dismissed because the plaintiff in such action or proceeding did not file an administrative claim as required by secton 2672 of that title, the plaintiff in that action or proceeding shall have 30 days from the date of the dismissal or 2 years from the date upon which the claim accrued, whichever is later, to file an administrative claim and any claim or subsequent civil action or proceeding shall thereafter be subject to the provisions of secton 2401(b) of title 28.

(d) For purposes of this section, "contractor" includes a contractor or cost reimbursement subcontractor of any tier participating in the conduct of the United States atomic weapons testing program for the Department of Energy (or its predecessor agencies, including the Manhattan Engineer District, the Atomic Commission, and the Energy Research Administration). "Contractor" also includes facilities which conduct or have conducted research concerning health effects of ionizing radiation in connection with the testing under contract with the Department of Energy (or its predecessor agencies).

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy to be available not earlier than October 1, 1985, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1986 for programs set forth in this Act.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1984.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is draft legislation "To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes."

In accordance with section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2260), the bill authorizes appropriations of $252,478,000 for civil defense programs for fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1986.

The bill also would repeal the second proviso of section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act. That proviso, added in 1958, limits the amount which can be appropriated for four financial assistance programs which was also added to the Act in 1958 and made subject to a periodic review (every four years). One program has expired; another is not used; and a third has not nearly approached its limit. However, the original limit ($25 million) on financial contributions for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense employees (emergency management assistance (EMA)) has been increased on several occasions. It presently is set at $47 million, but in recent years without increasing the limit the authorization act has provided that an amount greater than the limit can be appropriated notwithstanding the limitation.

The Congress can and does review the amount appropriated each year for EMA, and through its reports and required reprograming can effectively control the amount expended. There will continue to be a need each year to raise the limit as program costs are based on wages which would continue to increase even if there is no program growth. The limit serves no real purpose and should be stricken from the legislation.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal for consideration of the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

GEORGE JETT,
General Counsel.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, to carry out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the sum of $252,478,000 and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 2. The second proviso of section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260) is repealed.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, there is set forth below the committee vote to report the Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1985.

In favor: Senators Tower, Thurmond, Goldwater, Warner, Humphrey, Cohen, Jepsen, Quayle, East, Wilson, Nunn, Stennis, Hart, Exon, Levin, Kennedy, Bingaman, and Dixon.

Opposed: None.

Vote: 18–0.

The other roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

FISCAL DATA

With respect to 5-year cost projections, under Public Law 91–510, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, certain Senate rules and procedures were revised. Shown below is the legislative language:

> SEC. 252(a)(1) The report accompanying each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall contain—
>
> > (A) an estimate, made by such committee, of the costs which would be insured in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in each of the five fiscal years following such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by such bill or joint resolution if less than five years), except that, in the case of measures affecting the revenues, such report shall require only an estimate of the gain or loss in revenues for a one-year period; and
> >
> > (B) a comparison of the estimate of costs described in subparagraph (A) made by such committee with any estimate of costs made by any Federal agency;
> >
> > (C) in lieu of such estimate or comparison, or both, a statement of the reason why compliance by the committee with requirements of subparagraph (A) or (B), or both, is impracticable.
>
> (2) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any such bill or joint resolution if such bill or joint resolution was reported in the Senate after the effective date of this subsection

and the report of that committee of the Senate which reported such bill or joint resolution does not comply with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

Below is the letter received in compliance with the legislation. The bill is an annual authorization and does not, within its own terms, generate costs beyond fiscal year 1985 even though the funds authorized to be obligated by this act may not be expended for several years in the future. The fiscal year authorizations herein provided are reviewed annually by the committee and the Congress.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1984.

Hon. JOHN G. TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-510), the enclosed schedule provides an estimate of how the authorization now requested in fiscal year 1985 will be expended over the fiscal year 1985-1990 period.

The uncertainty of future year Defense programs precludes precise projections, but the enclosed schedule provides my estimate of the range of authorizations required during each of the next four years to support the forces contained in the annual Defense Report on the fiscal year 1985 budget.

Sincerely,

VINCENT PURITANO,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Enclosure.

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year 1985 authorization request: $224,269 million:	*Million*
1985	$97,921
1986	67,521
1987	36,115
1988	14,109
1989	7,102
1990	1,200
Beyond	301

I estimate that to support the forces in the Annual Defense Report on the fiscal year 1985 budget, authorizations in the range of $224-326 billion for fiscal year 1986-1990 would be required.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1984.

Hon. JOHN TOWER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for the Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1985, as ordered reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 24, 1984.

Should the Committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on the attached cost estimate.

Sincerely,

ERIC HANUSHEK
(For Rudolph G. Penner).

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: Not yet assigned.

2. Bill title: Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1985.

3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, on May 24, 1984.

4. Bill purpose: This bill authorizes appropriations for the Armed Forces during fiscal year 1985 for:

The procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons;
Research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E);
Operation and maintenance (O&M);
Military Construction;
Atomic Energy Defense Activities;
Civil defense; and
Military personnel and compensation matters.

This bill prescribes authorized personnel strengths for each active duty component, for the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component, and for military training student loads.

The bill includes additional provisions which do not have a significant cost impact.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government: This bill would entail costs to the federal government in fiscal years 1985–1989, as shown in the table below.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1985 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Function 050:					
Procurement:					
Estimated authorization	100,696	61	217	369	73
Estimated outlays	14,583	36,367	27,030	10,783	6,509
RDT&E:					
Estimated authorization	32,592				
Estimated outlays	17,889	11,585	1,909	883	
O&M:					
Estimated authorization	80,822	14,502	1,522		
Estimated outlays	64,020				

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1985 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Military construction:					
Estimated authorization	9,383				
Estimated outlays	2,602	3,495	1,810	952	275
Atomic energy defense:					
Estimated authorization	7,328				
Estimated outlays	3,100	2,936	1,073	205	
Endstrengths:					
Estimated authorization	68,825				
Estimated outlays	66,787	2,039			
Pay raise limitation:					
Estimated authorization	−321				
Estimated outlays	−311	−10			
VHA limitation:					
Estimated authorization	−376	−360	−386	−412	−437
Estimated outlays	−365	−360	−385	−411	−436
Bonuses extension:					
Estimated authorization	551	649	192	192	134
Estimated outlays	535	646	206	192	136
Civil defense:					
Estimated authorization	190				
Estimated outlays	91	90	8		
Other 050:					
Estimated authorization	137	−19	−91	−162	−186
Estimated outlays	−112	137	7	−159	−184
Function 050 total:					
Estimated authorization	299,828	330	68	−13	−415
Estimated outlays	168,817	71,426	33,179	12,445	6,299
Function 270:					
Estimated authorization	224				
Estimated budget authority	295				
Estimated outlays	385	78	56		
Function 400:					
Estimated authorization	59				
Estimated outlays	57	2			
Function 600:					
Estimated authorization					
Estimated outlays	3	3	3	3	3
Function 700:					
Estimated budget authority	−1	−2	−2	−3	−2
Estimated outlays	−1	−2	−2	−3	−2
Function 950:					
Estimated authorization	99				
Estimated outlays	96	3			
Bill Total:					
Estimated authorization budget authority	300,504	328	−70	−16	−417
Estimated outlays	169,357	71,509	33,236	12,445	6,300

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Basis of estimate: All estimates assume that funds will be appropriated for the full amount of the authorization and will be available for obligation by October 1, 1984, unless otherwise specified. Outlays are estimated based on historical outlay rates for the relevant accounts.

The direct authorizations for procurement, RDT&E, operation and maintenance, military construction, atomic energy defense activities, and civil defense total $230.2 billion for 1985. This bill provides that the authorization for appropriations in O&M, RDT&E, and atomic energy defense activities be raised to reflect pay raises under current law for civilian employees; the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates this authorization to be about $762 million, consistent with its baseline economic assumptions. The military construction authorization includes extensions of previously authorized projects and the sale of certain property.

The estimated costs of authorized active and reserve military personnel levels are based on average pay and allowances under current law, including an amount for retired pay accrual.

In addition to specifying personnel levels, the bill also authorizes certain changes in military compensation. Under current law, federal employees receive pay raises each October, as determined by the President and the Congress under the provisions of the Pay Comparability Act of 1974 and the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970. This bill changes current law to provide pay raises for military personnel in January 1985 instead of October 1984. The pay raise authorized in this bill saves $321 million in estimated authorization and $311 million in estimated outlay from the 3.3 percent pay raise contained in the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) baseline economic assumptions of February 1984.

In contrast to current law, the pay raise does not apply to basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) rates and enlisted personnel in pay grade E-1 with under four months of service. The BAQ tables have been restructure so that the BAQ for each pay grade represents 65 percent of median housing costs incurred by service members nationwide.

Section 142 provides for modificiations to the Variable Housing Allowance (VHA) program. First, changes made in the VHA program in the Department of Defense appropriation and authorization acts of 1984 are extended to the three month period beginning October 1, 1984 and ending January 1, 1985. In addition, this section further changes that way VHA is calculated beginning in January 1985 by specifying that the monthly amount of VHA paid to a member is the difference between the median monthly cost of housing in a given area and 80 percent of the median monthly cost of housing in the United States for members serving in the same pay grade. Furthermore, this section specifies that the total amount for VHA paid in any fiscal year may not increase faster than the military housing cost index. Using DoD data, the CBO estimates that the combination of the changes in BAQ and VHA will save approximately $376 million relative to current law in fiscal year 1985.

Section 146 extends the authority to pay enlistment and reenlistment bonuses to members of the active forces. This authority is extended for a two-year period, ending September 30, 1986. The estimated authorization is $551 million in 1985 and $649 million in 1986. The costs in 1987-1989 are associated with anniversary payments for those obligations incurred in 1985-1986.

In addition, Sections 143 through 178 contain several provisions that have a combined cost of $137 million in 1985. The cost provisions include reimbursement for accommodations in place of quarters, termination of the social security offset for some Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) beneficiaries, extension of Aviation Officer Continuation Pay for one year, equalization of seven Hazardous Duty

Pay rates, a new ceiling for flag and general officers, and several CHAMPUS provisions dealing with vision and chiropractor care. These sections also include provisions that produce savings from termination of the longevity credit for the Delayed Enlistment Program, forfeiture of accrued leave for some members, and limitation on shipment of cars through Guam.

Provisions under section 1014 would divert 30 percent of the net income of the Naval Petroleum Reserve in fiscal year 1985, about $295 million, to the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund, a revolving fund. Without this legislation, these funds would have been a receipt under function 270. The $295 million would be a function 050 collection in fiscal year 1985 and would be spent over three years to acquire materials for the strategic stockpile. About $50 million would be spent in 1985, $150 million in 1986, and $95 million in 1987 for these acquisitions.

Outlays in function 270 rise by $519 million over 1985–1987 because of the forgone receipts and because the bill authorizes appropriations of $224 million for exploration, development, operation, and related expenses.

The bill authorizes an average strength of 12,500 for the Coast Guard Reserve; the associated costs fall under budget function 400.

Section 149 raises the retired pay of certain reservists who were recalled to active duty from 1963–1971. Assuming an enactment date of October 1, 1984, this provision would cause approximately $2.9 million in additional estimated outlays from the trust fund for military retirement (function 600) in fiscal year 1985. Earlier enactment probably would require minor reprogramming within the Defense Department (function 050).

Section 155 would repeal the December 31, 1989 termination date for education benefits under the GI bill. The Department of Defense would pay for the benefits after 1989. This section is estimated to save a total of $10 million from 1985 through 1989 and then cost a total of $1.2 billion dollars from 1990 through 2015, when the last trainee is projected to receive benefits. The bulk of the costs would occur between 1990 and 2000. In 1990 the estimated cost would be $140 million and by the year 2000 costs would fall to $46 million. After 2000, the costs would fall gradually until all of those eligible and desiring to train would use their benefits. The savings from this bill would fall in function 700, since the Veteran's Administration is currently paying for the GI Bill. The costs, which would occur after 1989, would fall in function 050.

By limiting military pay raises, the bill reduces offsetting receipts recorded in function 950. This function receives payments from the Defense Department for retired pay accruals including amounts associated with pay raises.

6. Estimated cost to state and local governments: None.

7. Estimate comparisons: None.

8. Previous CBO estimate: None.

9. Estimate prepared by: Eugene F. Bryton, Julia H. Doherty, Patrick L. Haar, Barbara Hollinshead, Kelly Lukins, Jeffrey W. Nitta, Edward Shephard.

10. Estimate approved by: C. G. Nuckols (For James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis).

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON PROCUREMENT, R.D.T.&E., OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND CIVIL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Fiscal year	Authorization request	Senate authorization	House authorization	Conference	Appropriated
1964	$15,358,691,000	$14,951,491,000	$15,856,391,000	$15,314,291,000	$14,364,690,000
1965	17,185,300,000	17,040,140,000	16,914,800,000	16,967,620,000	16,722,391,000
1966	19,363,050,000	15,283,800,000	15,303,400,000	[1] 19,468,250,000	[1] 19,320,550,000
1967	20,769,659,000	17,170,059,000	17,858,059,000	[1] 21,404,459,000	[1] 21,057,559,000
1968	21,066,432,000	20,765,332,000	21,481,032,000	21,168,032,000	30,149,432,000
1969	22,385,052,000	21,341,738,000	21,636,964,000	21,625,750,000	18,491,041,000
1970	21,963,660,000	19,988,886,000	21,347,860,000	20,710,502,000	[2] 19,311,520,000
1971	20,317,430,000	[3] 19,242,889,000	20,237,439,000	[3] 19,929,089,000	[3] 18,997,376,000
1972	[4 5 7] 22,359,129,000	[6] 21,016,417,000	[5] 21,252,682,000	[6] 21,316,870,000	20,461,802,000
1973	[8] 23,272,971,000	20,521,671,000	21,318,788,520	[9] 21,588,747,000	19,567,838,000
1974 [10 12]	21,959,100,000	20,947,563,000	20,445,255,000	21,299,520,000	20,163,250,000
1975 [11]	23,130,139,000	21,819,371,000	22,642,963,000	22,195,037,000	[13] 20,892,[illegible]40,000
1976	28,562,388,000	[15] 25,233,535,000	26,539,023,000	25,513,383,000	24,850,879,000
197T	5,863,737,000	5,271,798,000	5,474,017,000	5,354,723,000	5,193,638,000
1977	[14] 34,218,765,000	31,831,348,000	33,256,443,000	32,522,202,000	31,626,183,000
1978	[16] 36,258,150,000	36,329,077,000	36,484,962,000	36,573,681,000	33,771,625,000
1979	[17] 37,486,012,000	37,339,869,000	36,557,869,000	37,255,969,000	35,461,500,000
1980	40,123,241,000	40,108,896,000	41,393,243,000	41,390,457,000	40,644,202,000
1981 [18]	49,867,194,000	54,697,886,000	55,718,266,000	55,523,246,000	53,487,013,000
1982 [19]	136,491,251,000	136,536,111,000	136,111,036,000	130,696,451,000	129,403,191,000
1983	183,451,654,000	177,397,810,000	177,066,115,000	177,867,548,000	169,513,224,000
1984	197,968,162,000	186,052,235,000	187,771,900,000	187,490,599,000	182,544,079,000
1985	224,496,604,000	213,542,429,000	208,053,804,000		

---

[1] Includes supplemental which is not included in House/Senate authorizations since supplemental request was received subsequent to House/Senate action on initial authorization request.

[2] Of this amount $350,000,000 to be derived by transfer from stock funds.

[3] Includes $334,000,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.

[4] Reflects budget amendment submitted subsequent to House action (+$111,000,000).

[5] Includes $183,600,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.

[6] Includes $109,570,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.

[7] Includes $59,762,000 additional requested for civilian pay increases pursuant to Public Law 91-656.

[8] Includes $3,000,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under R.D.T.&E. appropriation: includes fiscal year 1973 budget amendments of $54,000,000 for civilian personnel pay raise, $254,800,000 for various programs, and June 27, 1972, amendments of $770,000,000 for Southeast Asia and SALT related items.

[9] Includes $644,900,000 additional authorization in sec. 801 of Public Law 92-570.

[10] Includes $2,600,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under R.D.T.&E appropriation.

[11] Includes $2,570,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under R.D.T.&E. appropriation.

[12] Does not include the Feb. 4, 1974 supplemental authorization request for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $1,244,589,000.

[13] Does not include $700,000 appropriated for military support of South Vietnam.

[14] Includes authorization amendments ($97,000,000 addition to Air Force missiles for Minuteman $974,000 addition to Navy shipbuilding and $200,000,000 for Navy R.D.T.&E.). These amendments were received subsequent to, and therefore not considered in, house authorization action.

[15] Includes $221,000,000 fiscal year 1976 supplemental authorization for repair and modernization of the U.S.S. Belknap guided missile cruiser.

[16] Includes the July 13, 1977, supplemental authorization for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $404,970,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.

[17] Includes the Feb. 28, 1979, amended supplemental authorization request for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $2,002,200,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.

[18] Includes the Mar. 11, 1981, supplemental authorization request for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $2,958,594,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.

[19] Does not include supplemental authorization request for fiscal year 1982 for procurement, R.D.T.&E. and operation and maintenance in the amount of $1,451,800,000.

Notes: During fiscal years 1964 and 1965 tracked combat vehicles were not subject to authorization action.

During fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 the emergency fund under R.&D. was not subject to authorization action.

Authorization for other weapons was not required prior to fiscal year 1971.

Authorization for torpedoes and related support equipment was not required prior to fiscal year 1972.

Senate/House authorizations reflect only those major weapons systems for South Vietnam support which would be subject to authorization process (excludes personnel and operating funds).

Authorization for civil defense was not required prior to fiscal year 1978.

Authorization for operations and maintenance was not required prior to fiscal year 1982.

Authorization for ammunition and other procurement was not required prior to fiscal year 1983.

Authorization for working capital funds was not required prior to fiscal year 1985.

RELATIONSHIP OF ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

HISTORY OF SECTION 138, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

(Superseding "Section 412")

The jurisdiction of the committee so far as specific annual authorizations are concerned was increased significantly in 1959 by the enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149 which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. That law was amended and expanded as follows:

In 1962 (Public Law 87-436) to require similar authorization of appropriations for research, development, test, or evaluation associated with aircraft missiles, and naval vessels;

In 1963 (Public Law 88-174) to require authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test, or evaluation carried on by the Department of Defense;

In 1965 (Public Law 89-37) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

In 1967 (Public Law 90-168) to require annual authorization of the personnel strengths of each of the Selected Reserves of the Reserve components as a prior condition for the appropriation of funds for the pay and allowances for the Reserve components;

In 1969 (Public Law 91-121) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of other weapons to or for the use of any armed force of the United States. (Essentially, heavy, medium, and light artillery, antiaircraft artillery, rifles, machineguns, mortars, small arms weapons, and any crew-fired piece using fixed ammunition);

In 1970 (Public Law 91-441) to require authorization of appropriations to or for the use of the Navy for the procurement of torpedoes and related support equipment; and to require authorization of the average annual active duty personnel strength for each component of the Armed Forces as a condition precedent to the appropriation of funds for this purpose;

In 1972 (Public Law 92-436) to require annual authorization for the average military training student loads for each component of the Armed Forces, and modified the provisions relating to authorization for active duty personnel strength;

In 1973 (Public Law 93-155) to require authorization for end strength civilian employment for each component of the Defense Department in each fiscal year;

In 1975 (Public Law 94-106) to require the annual authorization of military construction of ammunition facilities;

In 1980 (Public Law 96-342) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for the operation and maintenance of any armed force or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1981; and

In 1982 (Public Law 97-86) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for procurement of ammunition or other procurement for any armed force or for agencies of the Department of Defense (other than military departments).

Also, in 1973 these enactments were codified by section 803(a) of Public Law 93-155 into Title 10, United States Code, as section 138. The law today reads as follows:

SEC. 138. ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR THE ARMED FORCES; ANNUAL MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS AND OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE REPORTS

(a) No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of any armed force or obligated or expended for—

(1) procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels;

(2) any research, development, test, or evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto;

(3) procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

(4) procurement of other weapons;

(5) procurement of naval torpedoes and related support equipment;

(6) military construction (as defined in subsection (f)); or

(7) the operation and maintenance of any armed forces or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

(8) procurement of ammunition; or

(9) other procurement by any armed force or by the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

unless funds therefor have been specifically authorized by law.

(b)(1) Congress shall authorize the average personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members on any reserve component of the armed forces unless the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of that reserve component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress each year, not later than February 15, a written report concerning the equipment of the National Guard and the reserve components of the armed forces for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Each such report shall include—

(A) recommendations as to the type and quantity of each major item of equipment which should be in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces;

(B) the quantity and average age of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be physically available in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component as of the beginning of each fiscal year covered by the report;

(C) the quantity and cost of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be procured for the Selective Reserve of the Ready Reserve and each reserve component from commercial sources or to be transferred to each such Selected

Reserve from the active-duty components of the armed forces; and

(D) the quantity of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be retired, decommissioned, transferred, or otherwise removed from the physical inventory of the Selected Reserve of the ready reserve of each reserve component and the plans for replacement of that equipment.

The report required by this paragraph shall be prepared and expressed in the same format and with the same level of detail as the information presented in the annual Five Year Defense Program Procurement Annex prepared by the Department of Defense.

REGULATORY IMPACT

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of a bill be included in the report on such bill. The committee finds that in the case of the Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1985, there is no regulatory impact.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing laws proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: Existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed in shown in roman.

TITLE 10—ARMED FORCES

Subtitle A—General Military Law

* * * * * * *

PART IV—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

Chap.	Sec.
* * * * * * *	
141. Miscellaneous Procurement Provisions	2381
142. Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program	2411

PART I—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL MILITARY POWERS

Chap.	Sec.
1. Definitions	101
3. General Powers	121
4. Department of Defense	131
5. Joint Chiefs of Staff	141
7. Boards, Councils, and Committees	171
8. Defense Agencies	191
9. Regular Components. [No present sections]	
11. Reserve Components	261
13. The Militia	311

Chap. Sec.
15. Insurrection 331
17. Arming of American Vessels 351
18. Military Cooperation With Civilian Law Enforcement Officials 371

CHAPTER 1—DEFINITIONS

Sec.
101. Definitions.

§ 101. Definitions

In addition to the definitions in sections 1–5 of title 1, the following definitions apply in this title:

* * * * * * *

(22) "Active duty" means full-time duty in the active military service of the United States. It includes full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned. *It does not include full-time National Guard duty.*

* * * * * * *

(24) "Active service" means service on active duty *or full-time National Guard duty.*

* * * * * * *

(42) "Full-time National Guard duty" means training or other duty, other than inactive duty, performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States in the member's status as a member of the National Guard of a State or territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32 for which the member is entitled to pay from the United States or for which the member has waived pay from the United States.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 4—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Sec.
131 Executive department.
132 Seal.
133 Secretary of Defense: appointment; powers and duties; delegation by.
133a. Secretary of Defense: annual report on North Atlantic Treaty Organization readiness.
133b. Sale or transfer of defense articles: reports to Congress.
134. Deputy Secretary of Defense: appointment; powers and duties; precedence.
135. Under Secretaries of Defense: appointment; powers and duties; precedence.
136. Assistant Secretaries of Defense: appointment; powers and duties; precedence.
136a. Director of Operational Test and Evaluation: appointment; powers and duties.
137. General Counsel: appointment; powers and duties.
138. Annual authorization of appropriations and personnel strengths for the armed forces; annual manpower requirements and operations and maintenance reports.
139. Secretary of Defense: weapons development and procurement schedules for armed forces; reports; supplemental reports.
139a. Oversight of cost growth in major programs: Selected Acquisition Reports.
139b. Oversight of cost growth in major programs: unit cost reports.
139c. Major defense acquisition programs: independent cost estimates.

140. Emergencies and extraordinary expenses.
140a. Secretary of Defense: funds transfers for foreign cryptologic support.
140b. Prohibition of certain civilian personnel management constraints.
140c. Secretary of Defense: authority to withhold from public disclosure certain technical data.

* * * * * * *

§ 139a. Oversight of cost growth in major programs: Selected Acquisition Reports

(a) In this section:

* * * * * * *

(3) "Procurement unit cost", with respect to a major defense acquisition program, means the amount equal to (A) the total of all [procurement funds appropriated] *funds programed to be available for obligation for procurement* for the program for a fiscal year, reduced by the amount [of funds appropriated] *of funds programed to be available for obligation* for such fiscal year for advanced procurement for such program in any subsequent year and increased by any amount appropriated in years before such fiscal year for advanced procurement for such program in such fiscal year, divided by (B) the number of fully-configured end items to be procured with such funds during such fiscal year.

(4) "Major contract", with respect to a major defense acquisition program, means (A) each prime contract under the program, and (B) each associate or Government-furnished equipment contract under the program that is one of the six largest contracts under the program in dollar amount *and that is in excess of $2,000,000.*

(b)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress at the end of each fiscal-year quarter a report on current major defense acquisition programs. Except as provided in paragraph (2) and (3), each such report shall include a status report on each defense acquisition program that at the end of such quarter is a major defense acquisition program. Reports under this section shall be known as Selected Acquisition Reports.

(2) A status report on a major defense acquisition program need not be included in the Selected Acquisition Report for the second, third, or fourth quarter of a fiscal year if such a report was included in a previous Selected Acquisition Report for that fiscal year and [there has been no change in program cost, performance, or schedule since the most recent such report.] *during the period since that report there has been—*

(A) less than a 5 percent change in total program cost; and

(B) less than a three-month delay in any program schedule milestone shown in the Selected Acquisition Report.

(3) A status report on a particular major defense acquisition program need not be included in any Selected Acquisition Report with the approval of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

* * * * * * *

(f) Each comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Report shall be submitted within [30] *60* days after the date on which the President transmits the Budget to Congress for the following fiscal year, and each Quarterly Selected Acquisition Report shall be submitted within [30] *45* days after the end of the fiscal-year quarter. [If a preliminary report is submitted for the comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Report in any year, the final report shall be submitted within 15 days after the submission of the preliminary report] *A preliminary report shall be submitted for each annual Selected Acquisition Report within 30 days of the date on which the President submits the Budget to Congress.*

(g) The requirements of this section with respect to a major defense acquisition program shall cease to apply after 90 percent of the items to be delivered to the United States under the program (shown as the total quantity of items to be purchased under the program in the most recent Selected acquisition Report) have been delivered or 90 percent of planned expenditures under the program have been made.

§ 139b. Oversight of cost growth of major programs: unit cost reports

(a) In this section:

(1) "Major defense acquisition program", "program acquisition unit cost", "procurement unit cost", and "major contract" have the same meanings as provided in section 139a(a) of this title.

(2) "Baseline Selected Acquisition Report", with respect to a unit cost report that is submitted under this section to the Secretary concerned on a major defense acquisition program, means the Selected Acquisition Report in which information on the program is first included or the comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Report for the fiscal year immediately before the fiscal year containing the quarter with respect to which the unit cost report is submitted, whichever is later.

(3) "Procurement program" means a program for which funds for procurement are authorized to be appropriated in a fiscal year.

(4) "Baseline Report", with respect to a unit cost report that is submitted under this section to the Secretary concerned on a major defense acquisition program, means—

(A) the most recent unit cost report submitted under subsection (e)(2)(B)(ii) with respect to the program, if that report was submitted for the second, third, or fourth quarter of the preceding fiscal year;

(B) if no report was submitted under subsection (e)(2)(B)(ii) with respect to the program during that three-quarter period, the most recent unit cost report submitted under subsection (e)(1) with respect to the program, if that report was submitted during that three-quarter period; and

(C) if no report was submitted with respect to the program under subsection (e)(1) or (e)(B)(ii) during that three-quarter period, the baseline Selected Acquisition Report.

(b) The program manager for a defense acquisition program that as of the end of a fiscal-year quarter is a major defense acquisition program (other than a program not required to be included in the Selected Acquisition Report for the quarter under section 139a(b)(3) of this title) shall, [not more than 7 days] after the end of that quarter, submit to the Secretary concerned a written report on the unit costs of the program. *Each report for the first quarter of a fiscal year shall be submitted not more than 7 days after the date on which the President transmits the Budget to Congress for the following fiscal year, and each report for other quarters shall be submitted not more than 7 days after the end of that quarter.* The program manager shall include in each such unit cost report the following information with respect to the program (as of the last day of the quarter for which the report is made):

(1) The program acquisition unit cost.

(2) In the case of a procurement program, the procurement unit cost.

(3) Any cost variance or schedule variance in a major contract under the program since the baseline [Selected Acquisition Report] *baseline report* was submitted.

(4) Any changes from program schedule milestones or program performances reflected in the baseline Selected Acquisition Report that are known, expected, or anticipated by the program manager.

(c)(1) If the program manager of a major defense acquisition program for which a unit cost report has previously been submitted under subsection (b) determines at any time during a fiscal-year quarter that there is reasonable cause to believe—

(A) that the program acquisition unit cost for the program has increased by more than 15 percent over the program acquisition unit cost for the program as shown in the [baseline Selected Acquisition Report] *baseline report;*

(B) in the case of a major defense acquisition program that is a procurement program, that the current procurement unit cost for the program has increased by more than 15 percent over the procurement unit cost for the program as reflected in the [baseline Selected Acquisiton Report] *baseline report; or*

(C) that cost variances or schedule variances of a major contract under the program have resulted in an increase in the cost of the contract of at least 15 percent over the cost of the contract as of the time the contract was made;

and if a unit cost report indicating an increase of such percentage or more has not previously been submitted to the Secretary concerned during the current fiscal year (other than the unit cost report under subsection (b) for the last quarter of the preceding fiscal year), then the program manager shall immediately submit to the Secretary concerned a unit cost report containing the information, determined as of the date of the report, required under subsection (b).

* * * * * * *

(d)(1) When a unit cost report is submitted to the Secretary concerned under this section with respect to a major defense acquisition program, the Secretary shall determine whether the current program acquisition unit cost for the program has increased by more than 15 percent, or by more than 25 percent, over the program acquisition unit cost for the program as shown in the [baseline Selected Acquisition Report] *baseline report.*

(2) When a unit cost report is submitted to the Secretary concerned under this section with respect to a major defense acquisi-

tion program that is a procurement program, the Secretary concerned shall, in addition to the determination under paragraph (1), determine whether the current procurement unit cost for the program has increased by more than 15 percent, or by more than 25 percent over the procurement unit cost for the program as reflected in the [baseline Selected Acquisition Report] *baseline report.*

(3) If the Secretary concerned determines (for the first time since the beginning of the current fiscal year) that the current program acquisition unit cost has increased by more than 15 percent, or by more than 25 percent, as determined under paragraph (1) or that the current procurement unit cost has increased by more than 15 percent, or by more than 25 percent, as determined under paragraph (2)—

(A) the Secretary shall notify Congress in writing of such determination and of the increase with respect to such program within 30 days after the date on which the unit cost report that is the basis for such determination was submitted to him and shall include in such notification the date on which the determination was made; and

(B) expect as provided in subsection (e), [additional funds may not be obligated in connection with such program] *funds appropriated for military construction, for research, development, test, and evaluation, and for procurement may not be obligated for a major contract under the program*

(i) after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the day on which the Secretary makes such determination, in the case of a percentage increase of more than 15 [but less than 25 percent]; or

(ii) after the end of the 60-day period beginning on the day on which the Secretary makes such determination, in the case of a percentage increase of more than 25 percent.

(e)(1) The prohibition in subsection [(d)(3)(B)] *(d)(3)(B)(i)* on the obligation of funds for a major defense acquisition program does not apply in the case of a program to which it would otherwise apply in the case of a determination of a *more than* 15 percent increase (as determined under subsection (d)) if the Secretary concerned submits to Congress before the end of the 30-day period referred to in such subsection, a report containing the information described in subsection (g).

(2) The prohibition in subsection [(d)(3)(B)] *(d)(3)(B)(ii)* on the obligation of funds for a major defense acquisition program does not apply in the case of a program to which it would otherwise apply, in the case of determination of a *more than* 25 percent increase (as determined under subsection (d))—

(A) if the increase was due to termination or cancellation of the acquisition program *and the Secretary concerned submits to Congress, before the end of the 30-day period referred to in subsection (d)(3)(B)(i), a report containing the information described in subsection (g)*; or

(B) if the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress, before the end of the 60-day period referred to in [such subsection] *subsection (a)(3)(B)(ii)—*

(i) a written certification stating that—

(I) such acquisition program is essential to the national security;

(II) there are no alternatives to such acquisition program which will provide equal or greater military capability at less cost;

(III) the new estimates of the program acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost are reasonable; and

(IV) the management structure for the acquisition program is adequate to manage and control program acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost; and

* * * * * * *

(g)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each report under subsection (e) with respect to a major defense acquisition program shall include the following:

(A) The name of the major defense acquisition program.

(B) The date of the preparation of the report.

(C) The program phase as of the date of the preparation of the report.

(D) The estimate of the program acquisition cost for the program as shown in the Selected Acquisition Report in which the program was first included, expressed in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars.

(E) The current program acquisition cost in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars.

(F) A statement of the reasons for any increase in program acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost.

(G) The completion status of the program (i) expressed as the percentage that the number of years for which funds have been appropriated for the program is of the number of years for which it is planned that funds will be appropriated for the program, and (ii) expressed as the percentage that the amount of funds that have been appropriated for the program is of the total amount of funds which it is planned will be appropriated for the program.

(H) The fiscal year in which information on the program was first included in a Selected Acquisition Report (referred to in this paragraph as the "base year") and the date of that Selected Acquisition Report in which information on the program was first included.

[(I) The date of the baseline Selected Acquisition Report.]

(I) The type of the Baseline Report (under subsection (a)(4)) and the date of the Baseline Report.

(J) The current change and the total change, in dollars and expressed as a percentage, in the program acquisition unit cost, stated both in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars.

(K) The current change and the total change, in dollars and expressed as a percentage, in the procurement unit cost, stated both in constant base-year dollars and in current dollars *and the procurement unit cost for the succeeding fiscal year ex-*

pressed in constant base-year dollars and in current year dollars.

* * * * * * *

(h) If any provision of this section is held invalid, the remaining provisions of the section shall not be affected thereby.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 7—BOARDS, COUNCILS, AND COMMITTEES

* * * * * *

§ 175. Reserve Forces Policy Board

(a) There is in the Office of the Secretary of Defense a Reserve Forces Policy Board consisting of—

(1) a civilian chairman appointed by the Secretary of Defense;

(2) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs;

(3) an officer of the Regular Army designated by the Secretary of the Army;

(4) an officer of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps designated by the Scretary of the Navy;

(5) an officer of the Regular Air Force designated by the Secretary of the Air Force;

(6) four reserve officers designated by the Secretary of Defense upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, two of whom must be members of the Army National Guard of the Uniterd States, and two of whom must be members of the Army Reserve;

(7) four reserve officers designated by the Secretary of Defense upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, two of whom must be members of the Naval Reserve, and two of whom must be members of the Marine Corps Reserve;

(8) four reserve officers designated by the Secretary of Defense upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Air Force, two of whom must be members of the Air national Guard of the united States, and two of whom must be members of the Air Force Reserve; and

(9) a reserve officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who is a general officer or flag officer designated by the Chairman of the Board with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and who serves without vote as military adviser to the Chairman and as executive officer of the Board.

(b) Whenever the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of Transportation may designate **[**and officer of the Regular Coast Guard or the Coast Guard Reserve**]** *two officers of the Coast Guard, regular or reserve,* to serve as a voting member of the Board.

* * * * * * *

PART II--PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 31—ENLISTMENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 517. Authorized daily average: members in pay grades E-8 and E-9

(a) Except as provided in section 307 of title 37, the authorized daily average number of enlisted members on active duty (other than for training) in an armed force in pay grades E-8 and E-9 in a calendar year may not be more than 2 percent and 1 percent respectively, of the number of enlisted members of that armed force who are on active duty (other than for training) on January 1 of that year. In computing the limitations prescribed in the preceding sentence, there shall be excluded enlisted members of an armed force on active duty (other than for training) in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve component of an armed force.

(b) The number of enlisted members in pay grades E-8 and E-9 who may be on active duty *(other than for training) or on full-time National Guard duty under the authority of section 502 (f) of title 32 (other than for training)* as of the end of any fiscal year in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components [of the armed forces] *or the National Guard* may not exceed the number [prescribed for the grade and the armed force] *for that grade and armed force* in the following table:

[

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corp
E-9	314	156	143	6
E-8	1,494	381	617	56

]

Grade	*Army*	*Navy*	*Air Force*	*Marine Corp*
E-9	*517*	*156*	*87*	*9*
E-8	*2,295*	*381*	*455*	*74*

(c) Whenever the number of members serving in pay grade E-9 is less than the number authorized for that grade under subsection (a), or whenever the number of members serving in pay grade E-9 for duty described in subsection (b) is less than the number authorized for that grade under subsection (b), the difference between the two numbers may be applied to increase the number authorized under such subsection for pay grade E-8.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 32—OFFICER STRENGTH AND DISTRIBUTION IN GRADE

* * * * * * *

§ 524. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty for administration of the reserves in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and Navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain

(a) The number of reserve officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps who may be on active duty in each of the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, and of the Navy who may be on active duty in each of the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain, as of the end of any fiscal year for duty described in subclauses (B) and (C) of section 523(b)(1) of this title may not exceed the number for that grade and armed force in the following table:

[

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or Lieutenant Commander	1,948	823	408	95
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	967	520	303	48
Colonel or Navy Captain	338	177	171	23

]

Grade	*Army*	*Navy*	*Air Force*	*Marine Corps*
Major or Lieutenant Commander	*2,261*	*823*	*471*	*100*
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	*1,121*	*520*	*293*	*50*
Colonel or Navy Captain	*345*	*177*	*172*	*25*

(b) Whenever the number of offices serving in any grade is less than the number authorized for that grade under this section, the difference between the two numbers may be applied to increase the number authorized under this section for any lower grade.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 33—APPOINTMENTS IN REGULAR COMPONENTS

* * * * * * *

Subchapter I—Original Appointments of Regular Officers in Grades Above Warrant Officer Grades

* * * * * * *

§ 532. Qualifications for original appointment as a commissioned officer

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, an original appointment as a commissioned officer (other than as a commissioned warrant officer) in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, or Regular Marine Corps may be given only to a person who—

(1) is a citizen of the United States;

(2) is able to complete 20 years of active commissioned service before his fifty-fifth birthday;

(3) is of good moral character;

(4) is physically qualified for active service; and

(5) has such other special qualifications as the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe by regulation.

(b)(1) Original appointments in the Regular Army in the Medical Corps or Dental Corps, and original appointments in the Regular Air Force with a view to designation of an officer as a medical or dental officer, may be made in the grades of first lieutenant through colonel. Original appointments in the Regular Navy in the Medical Corps or Dental Corps may be made in the grades of lieutenant (junior grade) through captain. Such appointments may be made only from persons who are qualified doctors of medicine, osteopathy, *podiatric medicine,* or dentistry.

* * * * * * *

(3) To be eligible for an original appointment as a medical officer, a doctor of podiatric medicine must—

(A) be a graduate of college of podiatric medicine accredited by the Council of Podiatric Education of the American Podiatry Association;

(B) be licensed to practice podiatry in a State or in the District of Columbia; and

(C) have such other qualifications as the Secretary of the military department concerned prescribes after considering the recommendations, if any, of the Surgeon General of the military department concerned.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 36—PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE-DUTY LIST

* * * * * * *

Subchapter V—Additional Provisions Relating To Promotion, Separation, and Retirement

* * * * * * *

§ 641. Applicability of chapter

Officers in the following categories are not subject to this chapter (other than section 640):

(1) Reserve officers—

(A) on active duty for training;

(B) on active duty under section 175, 265, 3015, 3019, 3033, 3496, 5251, 5252, 8019, 8033, or 8496 of this title or section 708 of title 32;

(C) on active duty under section 672(d) of this title [or under section 502 or 503 of title 32] in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components;

(D) on active duty to pursue special work;

(E) ordered to active duty under section 673b of this title; [or]

(F) on active duty under section 10(b)(2) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 460(b)(2)) for the administration of the Selective Service System[.] *; or*

(G) on full-time National Guard duty.

* * * * * * *

§ 645. Definitions

In this chapter:

[(1) "Promotion zone" means a promotion eligibility category consisting of the officers on an active-duty list in the same grade and competitive category—

[(A) who—

[(i) in the case of officers in grades below colonel, for officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, or captain or commodore, for officers of the Navy, have neither (I) failed of selection for promotion to the next higher grade, nor (II) been removed from a list of officers recommended for promotion to that grade; or

[(ii) in the case of officers in the grade of colonel or brigadier general, for officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, or captain, for officers of the Navy, have neither (I) not been recommended for promotion to the next higher grade when considered in the promotion zone, nor (II) been removed from a list of officers recommended for promotion to that grade; or

[(B) are senior to the officer designated by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be the junior officer eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher grade in the promotion zone.]

(1) "Promotion zone" means a promotion eligibility category consisting of officers on an active-duty list in the same grade and competitive category who meet the requirements of both subparagraphs (A) and (B) or who meet the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(A)(i) In the case of officers in grades below colonel, for officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, or captain, for officers of the Navy, those who have neither (I) failed of selection for promotion to the next higher grade, nor (II) been removed from a list of officers recommended for promotion to that grade.

(ii) In the case of officers in the grade of colonel or brigadier general, for officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, or captain or commodore, for officers of the Navy, those who

have neither (I) not been recommended for promotion to the next higher grade when considered in the promotion zone, nor (II) been removed from a list of officers recommended for promotion to that grade.

(B) Those officers who are senior to the officer designated by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be the junior officer in the promotion zone eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher grade.

(C) Those officers who—

(i) have been selected from below the zone for promotion to the next higher grade but whose names were removed from the list of officers recommended for promotion to that next higher grade resulting from that selection;

(ii) have not failed of selection for promotion to that next higher grade; and

(iii) are senior to the officer designated by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be the junior officer in the promotion zone eligible for consideration for promotion to that next higher grade.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 39—ACTIVE DUTY

* * * * * * *

§ 680. Active duty agreements: release from duty

(a) Each agreement made under section 679(a) of this title shall provide that the member may not be released from active duty without his consent during the period of the agreement—

(1) because of a reduction in the actual personnel strength of the armed force concerned, unless the release is in accordance with the recommendation of a board of officers appointed by an authority designated by the Secretary concerned to determine the members to be released from active duty under regulations prescribed by the Secretary; or

(2) for any other reason, without an opportunity to be heard by a board of officers before the release, unless he is (A) dismissed or discharged under the sentence of a court-martial, (B) released because of an unexplained absence without leave for at least three months, (C) released because he is convicted and sentenced to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution and the sentence has become final, or (d) released because he has been considered at least twice and has not been recommended for promotion to the next higher grade or because he is considered as having failed of selection for promotion to the next higher grade and has not been recommended for promotion to that grade, under conditions that would require the release or separation of a Reserve Officer who is not serving under such an agreement.

(b) A member who is released from active duty without his consent before the end of his agreement made under section 679(a) of this title is entitled to an amount computed by multiplying the number of years and fractions of a year of his unexpired period of service under the agreement by the sum of one month's basic pay, special pay, and allowances to which he is entitled on the day of his release. The amount to which a member is entitled under this subsection is in addition to any pay and allowances to which he is otherwise entitled. For the purposes of this subsection, a fraction of a month of 15 days or more is counted as a whole month, and a fraction of a month of less than 15 days is disregarded. This subsection does not apply to a member if he is—

(1) released for a reason described in subsection (a)(2)(A)-(C);

(2) released because of a physical disability resulting from his intentional misconduct or wilful neglect;

(3) eligible for retired pay, *separation pay,* or severance pay under another provision of law;

(4) placed on a temporary disability retired list; or

(5) released to accept an appointment, or to be enlisted, in a regular component of an armed force.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 49—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

* * * * * * *

§ 976. Membership in military unions, organizing of military unions, and recognition of military unions prohibited

(a) In this section:

(1) "Member of the armed forces" means (A) a member of the armed forces who is serving on active duty, **[**or (B)**]**, *(B) a member of the National Guard who is serving on full-time National Guard duty, or (C)* a member of a Reserve component while performing inactive-duty training.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 53—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

Sec.

* * * * * * *

1043. Service credit: service in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or the Public Health Service.
1044. Legal assistance.

* * * * * * *

§ 1044. Legal assistance

(a)(1) Subject to the availability of adequate resources, the Secretary concerned shall provide members of the armed forces on active duty with legal assistance in connection with their personal affairs and may provide such assistance to dependents of members serving on active duty and to members entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay, and their dependents.

(2) The Secretary concerned shall define the term "dependent" for purposes of this section.

(b) The Judge Advocates General, as defined in section 801(1) of this title, are responsible for the establishment and supervision of

legal assistance programs under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as authority to provide legal counsel to represent in a court of law any member of the armed forces or the dependent of any such member who can afford legal fees for such representation without undue hardship.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 71—MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

* * * * * * *

§ 1077. Medical care for dependents; authorized care in facilities of uniformed services

(a) Only the following types of health care may be provided under section 1076 of this title:

(1) Hospitalization.

(2) Outpatient care.

(3) Drugs.

(4) Treatment of medical and surgical conditions.

(5) Treatment of nervous, mental, and chronic conditions.

(6) Treatment of contagious deseases.

(7) Physical examination, including eye examination, and immunizations.

(8) Maternity and infant care.

(9) Diagnostic tests and services, including laboratory and X-ray examinations.

[(10) Emergency dental care worldwide.]

[(11) Routine dental care outside the United States and at stations in the United States where adequate civilian facilities are unavailable.]

[(12) Dental care worldwide as a necessary adjunct of medical, surgical, or preventive treatment.]

(10) Dental care.

[(13)] *(11)* Ambulance service and home calls when medically necessary.

[(14)] *(12)* Durable equipment, such as wheelchairs, iron lungs, and hospital beds may provided on a loan basis.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 71—COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY

* * * * * * *

§ 1408. Payment of retired or retainer pay in compliance with court orders

(a) In this section:

* * * * * * *

(2) "Court order" means a final decree of divorce, dissolution, annulment, or legal separation issued by a court, or a court ordered, ratified, or approved property settlement incident to such a decree (including a final decree modifying the terms of a previously issued decree of divorce, dissolution, annulment, or legal separation, or a

court ordered, ratified, or approved property settlement incident to such previously issued decree), which—

(A) is issued in accordance with the laws of the jurisdiction of that court;

(B) provides for—

(i) payment of child support (as defined in section 462(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 662(b)));

(ii) payment of alimony (as defined in section 462(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 662(c))); or

(iii) division of property (including a division of community property); and

(C) *in the case of a division of property,* specifically provides for the payment of an amount, expressed in dollars or as a percentage of disposable retired or retainer pay, from the disposal retired or retainer pay of a member to the spouse or former spouse of that member.

* * * * * * *

(b) For the purposes of this section—

(1) service of a court order is effective if—

(A) an appropriate agent of the Secretary concerned designated for receipt of service of court orders under regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (h) or, if no agent has been so designated, the Secretary concerned, is personally served or is served by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested;

(B) the court order is regular on its face;

(C) the court order or other documents served with the court order identify the member concerned and include, *if possible,* the social security number of such member; and

(D) the court order or other documents served with the court order certify that the rights of the member under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) were observed; and

(2) a court order is regular on its face if the order—

(A) is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction;

(B) is legal in form; and

(C) includes nothing on its face that provides reasonable notice that it is issued without authority of law.

* * * * * * *

(d)(1)[After effective service on the Secretary concerned of a court order with respect to the payment of a portion of the retired or retainer pay of a member to the spouse or a former spouse of the member, the Secretary shall, subject to the limitations of this section, make payments to the spouse of former spouse in the amount of the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member specifically provided for in the court order.] *After effective service on the Secretary concerned of a court order providing for the payment of child support or alimony or, with respect to a division of property, specifically providing for the payment of an amount of the disposable retired or retainer pay from a member to the spouse or a former spouse of the member, the Secretary shall make payments (subject to the limitations of this section) from the disposable retired* *or retainer pay of the member to the spouse or former spouse in an amount sufficient to satisfy the amount of child support and alimony set forth in the court order and, with respect to a division of property, in the amount of disposable retired or retainer pay specifically provided for in the court order.* In the case of a member entitled to receive retired or retainer pay on the date of the effective service of the court order, such payments shall begin not later than 90 days after the date of effective service. In the case of a member not entitled to receive retired or retainer pay on the date of the effective service of the court order, such payments shall begin not later than 90 days after the date on which the member first becomes entitled to receive retired or retainer pay.

* * * * * * *

(5) If a court order described in paragraph (1) provides for a division of property (including a division of community property) in addition to an amount of [disposable retired or retainer pay, the Secretary concerned shall, subject to the limitations of this section, pay to the spouse or former spouse of the member, from the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member, any part] *child support or alimony or the payment of an amount of disposable retired or retainer pay as the result of the court's treatment of such pay under subsection (c) as property of the member and his spouse, the Secretary concerned shall pay (Subject to the limitations of this section) from the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member to the spouse or former spouse of the member, any part* of the amount payable to the spouse or former spouse under the division of property upon effective service of a final court order of garnishment of such amount from such retired or retainer pay.

(e)(1) The total amount of the disposable retired or retainer pay of a member payable under subsection (d) may not exceed 50 percent of such disposable retired or retainer pay.

(2) In the event of effective service of more than one court order which provide for payment to a spouse and one or more former spouses or to more than one former spouse [from the disposable retired or retainer pay of a member, such pay], *the disposable retired or retainer pay of the member* shall be used to satisfy (subject to the limitations of paragraph (1) such court orders on a first-come, first-served basis. Such court orders shall be satisfied (subject to the limitations of paragraph (1)) out of that amount of disposable retired or retainer pay which remains after the satisfaction of all court orders which have been previously served.

(3)(A) In the event of effective service of conflicting court orders under this section which assert to direct that different amounts be paid during a month to the same spouse or former spouse [from the disposable retired or retainer pay] of the same member, the Secretary concerned shall-

(i) pay to that spouse [the least amount of disposable retired or retainer pay] *from the member's disposable retired or retainer pay the least amount* directed to be paid during that month by any such conflicting court order, but not more than the amount of disposable retired or retainer pay which remains available for payment of such court orders based on when such court orders were effectively served and the limitations of paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4);

(ii) retain an amount of disposable retired or retainer pay that is equal to the lesser of—

(I) the difference between the largest amount [of retired or retainer pay] required by any conflicting court order to be paid to the spouse or former spouse and the amount payable to the spouse or former spouse under clause (i); and

(II) the amount of disposable retired or retainer pay which remains available for payment of any conflicting court order based on when such court order was effectively served and the limitations of paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4); and

(iii) pay to that member the amount which is equal to the amount of that member's disposable retired or retainer pay (less any amount paid during such month pursuant to legal process served under section 459 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 659) and any amount paid during such month pursuant to court orders effectively served under this section, other than such conflicting court orders) minus—

(I) the amount of disposable retired or retainer pay paid under clause (i); and

(II) the amount of disposable retired or retainer pay retained under clause (ii).

(B) The Secretary concerned shall hold the amount retained under clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) until such time as that Secretary is provided with a court order which has been certified by the member and the spouse or former spouse to be valid and applicable to the retained amount. Upon being provided with such an order, the Secretary shall pay the retained amount in accordance with the order.

(4)(A) In the event of effective service of a court order under this section and the service of legal process pursuant to section 459 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 659), both of which provide for payments during a month from [the retired or retainer pay of] the same member, [such court orders and legal process shall be satisfied] *satisfaction of such court orders and legal process from the retired or retainer pay of the member shall be* on a first-come, first-served basis. Such court orders and legal process shall be satisfied out of moneys which are subject to such orders and legal process and which remain available in accordance with the limitations of paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B) of this paragraph during such month after the satisfaction of all court orders or legal process which have been previously served.

(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount of the disposable retired or retainer pay of a member payable by the Secretary concerned under all court orders pursuant to this section and all legal processes pursuant to section 459 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 659) with respect to a member may not exceed 65 percent of the disposable retired or retainer pay payable to such member.

(5) A court order which itself or because of previously served court orders provides for the payment of an amount [of disposable

retired or retainer pay] which exceeds the amount of [such pay] *disposable retired or retainer pay* available for payment because of the limit set forth in paragraph (1), or which, because of previously served court orders or legal process previously served under section 459 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 659), provides for payments of an amount [of disposable retired or retainer pay] that exceeds the maximum amount permitted under paragraph (1) or subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), shall not be considered to be irregular on its face solely for that reason. However, such order shall be considered to be fully satisfied for purposes of this section by the payment to the spouse or former spouse of the maximum amount of disposable retired or retainer pay permitted under paragraph (1) and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4).

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 73—ANNUITIES BASED ON RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

* * * * * * *

Subchapter I—Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan

* * * * * * *

§ 1437. Payment of annuity

(a) Except as provided in [subsection (b)] *subsections (b) and (c),* each annuity payable under this subchapter accrues as of the first day of the month in which the person upon whose pay the annuity is based dies. Payments shall be made in equal installments and not later than the fifteenth day of each month following that month. However, no annuity accrues for the month in which entitlement thereto ends. The monthly amount of an annuity payable under this subchapter, if not a multiple of $1, shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1.

(b) Each annuity payable to or on behalf of an eligible child (other than a child who is incapable of supporting himself because of a mental defect or physical incapacity existing before his eighteenth birthday) as defined in section 1435(2)(B) of this title who is at least eighteen years of age and pursuing a full-time course of study or training at a recognized educational institution, accrues—

(1) as of the first day of the month in which the member upon whose pay the annuity is based dies, if the eligible child's eighteenth birthday occurs in the same or a preceding month.

(2) as of the first day of the month in which the eighteenth birthday of an eligible child occurs, if the member upon whose pay the annuity is based died in a preceding month.

(3) as of the first day of the month in which a child first becomes or again becomes eligible, if that eligible child's eighteenth birthday and the death of the member upon whose pay the annuity is based both occurred in a preceding month or months.

However, no such annuity is payable or accrues for any month before November 1, 1968.

(c)(1) The Secretary concerned may, upon application of the beneficiary of a member, determine for purposes of this subchapter that the member is missing. Any such determination shall be made pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 1444(a) of this title. The Secretary concerned may not make a determination that a member is missing for purposes of this subchapter unless he finds that—

(A) the member disappeared under circumstances that would lead a reasonably prudent person to conclude that the member is dead; and

(B) the member has been absent for at least 30 days.

(2) Following a determination made under the preceding paragraph, any annuity otherwise payable under the provisions of this subchapter shall be paid as if the member died on the date that the Secretary concerned determines the member disappeared. An annuity payable under the provisions of this subsection shall be subject to all reductions, deductions, conditions of entitlement, and computations otherwise applicable under this subchapter.

(3)(A) If the Secretary concerned determines, subsequent to a determination under paragraph (1), that the member is alive, the annuity being paid under this subsection shall be terminated and any annuity payments made on the basis of this subsection shall constitute a debt to the United States which, notwithstanding section 1441 of this title, may be collected or offset (i) from any military retired or retainer pay otherwise due the member, (ii) if the member is entitled to compensation under title 38, from that compensation, or (iii) if the participant is entitled to payments of any kind from the United States, from such payments.

(B) In the event of the death of the participant before full recovery of annuity payments described in subparagraph (A) has been made by the United States, such annuity payments may be collected from the participant's beneficiary under this subchapter if that beneficiary was the recipient of the annuity payments made under this subsection. In addition to the authority provided under this paragraph, the United States may collect any debt created by the payment of an annuity under this subsection under any other provision of law, or by a civil action in any district court of the United States.

(4) An annuity payable under this subsection shall be reduced by the amount of military retired or retainer pay paid to or on behalf of the member after the date of the member disappeared, as determined under paragraph (2) above.

* * * * * * *

§ 1440. Annuities not subject to legal process

[No**]** *Except as provided in section 1437(c)(3), no* annuity payable under this subchapter is assignable or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

* * * * * * *

Subchapter II—Survivor Benefit Plan

* * * * * * *

§ 1450. Payment of annuity: beneficiaries

(a) [Effective] *Except as provided in subsection (1), effective* as of the first day after the death of a person to whom section 1448 of this title applies (or on such other day as he may provide under subsection (j)), a monthly annuity under section 1451 of this title shall be paid to—

(1) the eligible widow or widower;

(2) the surviving dependent children in equal shares, if the eligible widow or widower is dead, dies, or otherwise becomes ineligible under this section;

(3) the dependent children in equal shares if the person to whom section 1448 of this title applies elected to provide an annuity for dependent children but not for the spouse; or

(4) the former spouse or other natural person designated under section 1448(b) of this title, unless the election to provide an annuity to the former spouse or other natural person has been changed as provided in subsection (f).

* * * * * * *

(f)(1) A person who elects to provide an annuity to a person designated by him under section 1448(b) of this title may, subject to paragraph (2), change that election and provide an annuity to his spouse or dependent child. The Secretary concerned shall notify the former spouse or other natural person previously designated under section 1448(b) of this title of any change of election under the first sentence of this paragraph. Any such change of election is subject to the same rules with respect to execution, revocation, and effectiveness as are set forth in section 1448(a)(5) of this title (without regard to the eligibility of the person making the change of election to make an election under such section).

(2) A person who, incident to a proceeding of divorce, dissolution, or annulment, enters into a voluntary written agreement to elect under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse and who makes an election pursuant to such agreement may not change such election under paragraph (1) unless—

(A) in a case in which such agreement has been incorporated in or ratified or approved by a court order, the person—

(i) furnishes to the Secretary concerned a certified copy of a court order which is regular on its face and modifies the provisions of all previous court orders relating to the agreement to make such election so as to permit the person to change the election; and

(ii) certifies to the Secretary concerned that the court order is valid and in effect; or

(B) in a case in which such agreement has not been incorporated or ratified or approved by a court order, the person—

(i) furnishes to the Secretary concerned a statement, in such form as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, signed by the former spouse and evidencing the former spouse's agreement to a change in the election under paragraph (1); and

(ii) certifies to the Secretary concerned that the statement is current and in effect.

(3)(A) If a person described in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 1448(b) of this title enters, incident to a proceeding of divorce, dissolution, or annulment into a voluntary written agreement to elect under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse and such agreement has been incorporated in or ratified or approved by a court order, and such person then fails or refuses to make such an election, such person shall be deemed to have made such an election if the Secretary concerned receives a written request, in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe, from the former spouse concerned that such an election be deemed to have been made and receives a copy of the court order, regular on its face, which incorporates, ratifies, or approves the voluntary written agreement of such person.

(B) An election may not be deemed to have been made under subparagraph (A) in the case of any person unless the Secretary concerned receives a request from the former spouse of the person on or before September 30, 1985, or within one year of the date of the court order involved, whichever is later.

(C) An election deemed to have been made under subparagraph (A) shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the court order involved.

[(3)**]** *(4)* Nothing in this chapter authorizes any court to order any person to elect under section 1448(b) of this title to provide an annuity to a former spouse unless such person has voluntarily agreed in writing to make such election.

* * * * * * *

(i) **[**An**]** *Except as provided in subsection (l), an* annuity under this section is not assignable or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

* * * * * * *

(l)(1) The Secretary concerned may, upon application of the beneficiary of a person participating in the Plan, determine for the purposes of this subchapter that the person is missing. Such a determination shall be made pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 1455 of this title. The Secretary concerned may not make a determination that a member is missing for purposes of this subchapter unless he finds that—

(A) the person participating in the Plan disappeared under circumstances which would lead a reasonably prudent person to conclude that such person is dead; and

(B) the person has been absent for at least 30 days.

(2) Following a determination made under the preceding paragraph, any annuity otherwise payable under the provisions of this subchapter shall be paid as if the person died on the date that the Secretary concerned determines the person disappeared. An annuity payable under the provisions of this subsection shall be subject to all reductions, deductions, conditions of entitlement, and computations otherwise applicable under this subchapter.

(3)(A) If the Secretary concerned determines, subsequent to a determination under paragraph (1) that the person is alive, the annuity being paid under this subsection shall be terminated and any annuity payments made on the basis of this subsection shall constitute a debt to the United States which, notwithstanding subsection (h), may be collected or offset (i) from any militlary retired or retainer pay otherwise due the person, (ii) if the person is entitled to compensation under title 38, from that compensation, or (iii) if the person is entitled to payments of any kind from the United States, from any such payments.

(B) In the event the death of the person before full recovery of annuity payments described in subparagraph (A) has been made by the United States, such annuity payments may be collected from his beneficiary under the Plan if that beneficiary was the recipient of the annuity payments previously made under this subsection. In addition to the authority provided under this paragraph, the United States may collect any debt created by the payment of an annuity under this subsection under any other provision of law, or by a civil action in any district court of the United States.

(4) An annuity payable under this subsection shal be reduced by the amount of military retired or retainer pay paid to or on behalf of the person after the date he disappeared as determined under paragraph (2) above.

§ 1451. Amount of annuity

(a)(1) The monthly annuity payable to a widow, widower, or dependent child who is entitled under section 1450(a) of this title to an annuity shall be—

(A) 55 percent of the base amount, as adjusted from time to time under section 1401a of this title, if the annuity is provided by virtue of eligibility under section 1448(a) (1)(A) of this title; or

(B) a lesser percentage (determined by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with subsection (d)) of the base amount, as adjusted from time to time under section 1401a of this title on or after the date the person becomes entitled to retired pay under chapter 67 of this title, if the annuity is provided by virtue of eligibility under section 1448(a)(1)(B) of this title.

(2) In the case of a widow who has one dependent child, the monthly annuity shall be reduced by the lesser of (A) an amount equal to the amount of the mother's benefit, if any, to which the widow would be entitled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) based solely upon service by the person concerned as described in section 210(*l*)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 410(*l*)(1) and calculated assuming that the person concerned lived to age 65, or (B) an amount equal to 40 percent of the amount of the monthly annuity as determined under paragraph (1).

(3) When the widow or widower reaches age 62, or there is no longer a dependent child, whichever occurs later, the monthly annuity shall be reduced by the lesser of (A) an amount equal to the amount of the survivor benefit, if any, to which the widow or widower [would be entitled] *is entitled* under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) based solely upon service by the person concerned as described in section 210(*l*)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 410(*l*)(1)) and calculated assuming that the person concerned

lives to age 65, or (B) an amount equal to 40 percent of the amount of the monthly annuity as determined under paragraph (1). For the purpose of the preceding sentence, a widow or widower shall not be considered as entitled to a benefit under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) to the extent that such benefit has been offset by deductions under section 203 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 403) on account of work[.] *or to the extent that the benefit to which the beneficiary is entitled is based on the beneficiary's own earnings or self-employment.*

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 103—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

* * * * * * *

§ 2107. Financial assistance program for specially selected members

* * * * * * *

(b) To be eligible for appointment as a cadet or midshipman under this section a member must—

(1) be a citizen of the United States;

(2) be specially selected for the financial assistance program under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

(3) enlist in the reserve component of the armed force in which he is appointed as a cadet or midshipmen for the period prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program; and

(5) agree in writing that, at the discretion of the Secretary of the military department concerned, he will—

(A)(i) accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that, if he is commissioned as a regular officer and his regular commission is terminated before the sixth anniversary of his date of rank, he will accept an appointment, if offered, in the reserve component of that armed force and not resign before that anniversary[,] *or before such other date, not beyond the eighth anniversary of the midshipman's date of rank, that the Secretary of Defense may prescribe;* and

(ii) serve on active duty for four or more years;

(B)(i) accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be; and

(ii) serve in a reserve component of that armed force until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of such appointment, unless otherwise extended by subsection (d) of section 2108 of this title, under such terms and conditions as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned; or

(C)(i) accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be; and

(ii) serve in a reserve component of that armed force until [the sixth anniversary] *at least the sixth anniversary and, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, up to the eighth anniversary* of the receipt of such appointment, unless such appointment is otherwise extended by subsection (d) of section 2108 of this title, under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

The performance of service under clause (5)(B) or (5)(C) may include periods of active duty, active duty for training, and other service in an active or inactive status in the reserve component in which appointed, except that performance of service under clause (5)(C) shall include not less than two years of active duty.

* * * * * * *

PART VI—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

Chap. Sec.

* * * * * * *

141. Miscllaneous Procurement Provisions 2381
142. Procurement Technical Assistance Coperative Agreement Program 2411

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 141—MISCELLANEOUS PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS

Sec.

* * * * * * *

2401. Requirement for authorization by law of certain contracts relating to vessels and aircraft.
2402. Major weapon systems and other defense equipment; contractor guarantees.
2403. Procurement of communications support and related supplies and services.".

* * * * * * *

§ 2402. Major weapon systems and other defense equipment; contractor guarantees

(a) In this section—

(1) 'Weapon system' and 'other defense equipment' mean items that can be used directly by the armed forces to carry out combat missions and that cost more than $100,000 per item or for which the eventual total procurement cost is more than $10,000,000. Such terms do not include commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public.

(2) 'Prime contractor' means a party that has entered into an agreement directly with the United States to furnish part or all of a weapon system or other defense equipment.

(3) 'Design and manufacturing requirements' means structural and engineering plans and manufacturing particulars, including precise measurements, tolerances, materials, processes, and in-process and finished product tests for the weapon system or other defense equipment being produced.

(4) "Essential performance requirements" means the operating capabilities or maintenance and reliability characteristics of a weapon system or other defense equipment that are determined by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary for the system or equipment to fulfill the military requirement for which it is designed.

(5) "Component" means any constituent element of a weapon system or other defense equipment.

(6) "Mature full-scale production" means the manufacture of all units of a weapon system or other defense equipment after the manufacture of the first one-tenth of the eventual total production or the initial production quantity of such system or equipment, whichever is less.

(7) "Initial production quantity" means the number of units of a weapon system or other defense equipment contracted for in the first year of full-scale production.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, funds appropriated to or for the use of the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended for the procurement of a weapon system or other defense equipment under a contract entered into after the date of enactment of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985, unless the prime contractor or prime contractors for such system or equipment provide the United States with written guarantees that—

(1) the weapon system or other defense equipment conforms to the design and manufacturing requirements and essential performance requirements, as specifically delineated in the production contract or in any amendments thereto;

(2) the weapon system or other defense equipment, at the time it was delivered to the United States, was free from all defects in materials and workmanship; and

(3) in the event of a failure of the weapon system or other defense equipment to meet the guarantee specified in clause (1) or (2), the contractor will, at the election of the Secretary of Defense—

(A) promptly take such corrective action as may be necessary to correct the failure at no additional cost to the United States; or

(B) pay costs incurred by the United States in taking such corrective action.

(c)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall not require guarantees under subsection (b) from a prime contractor for a weapon system or other defense equipment, or a component of a weapon system or other defense equipment, furnished by the United States to the prime contractor.

(2) A written guarantee by a contractor under subsection (a) (1) shall not cover damage to a weapon system or other defense equipment resulting from combat.

(d) The Secretary of Defense may waive part or all of the requirements of subsection (b) in the case of a weapon system or other defense equipment if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the waiver is necessary in the interest of national defense; or

(2) the guarantee required under such subsection would not be cost-effective.

(e) In the case of each waiver made under subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) notify the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives in writing of his intention to waive any or all of the requirements of this section with respect to such weapon system or other defense equipment which is a major defense acquisition program for the purpose of section 139a of title 10, United States Code, and shall include in the notice an explanation of the reasons for the waiver; or

(2) notify the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives in an annual report submitted not later than February 1 each year of waivers made during the preceding calendar year for weapon systems or other defense equipment which are not major defense acquisition programs for the purpose of section 139a of title 10, United States Code, and shall include in the report an explanation of the reasons for the waivers.

(f) The requirement for a written guarantee under subsection (b)(1) shall apply only to contracts for weapon systems and other defense equipment in mature full-scale production. However, nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from negotiating guarantees similar to the one described in such subsection for weapon systems and other defense equipment not yet in mature full-scale production. When a contract for a weapon system not yet in mature full-scale production is not to include the full guarantee described in subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall comply with the notice requirements of subsection (e).

(g) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Secretary of Defense from—

(1) delegating any authority given him by this section, except that the Secretary may not delegate the waiver authority under subsection (d) to any person who holds a position below the level of assistant secretary of defense or assistant secretary of a military department;

(2) negotiating the specific details of a guarantee, so long as the negotiated guarantee is consistent with the general requirements of this section;

(3) requiring that components of a weapon system or other defense equipment furnished by the United States to a contractor be properly installed so as not to invalidate any warranty or guarantee provided by the manufacturer of such component to the United States;

(4) reducing the price of any contract for a weapon system or other defense equipment to take account of any payment due from a contractor pursuant to subclause (B) of subsection (b) (3); and

(5) in the case of a dual source procurement, exempting from the requirements of subsection (b) (1) an amount of production by the second source contractor equivalent to the first one-tenth of the eventual total production by the second source contractor.

(6) utilizing written guarantees to a greater extent than required by this section, including guarantees that exceed those in clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and guarantees that provide more comprehensive remedies than the remedies specified in subsection (b) (3).

(h) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

§ 2403. Procurement of communications support and related supplies and services

(a) As an alternative means of obtaining communications support and related supplies and services, the Secretary of Defense, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, may enter into an arrangement with the Minister of Defense or other appropriate official of any allied country or with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), under which, in return for being provided comunications support and related supplies and services, the United States would agree to provide to such country or NATO an equivalent value of communications support and related supplies and services.

(b) Any arrangement entered into under this section shall require that any accrued credits and liabilities resulting from an unequal exchange of communications support and related supplies and services during the term of such arrangement would be liquidated by direct payment to the party having provided the greater amount of communications support and related supplies and services. Payments received by the United States shall be credited to the appropriation from which such communications support and related supplies and services have been provided.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives copies of all documents evidencing an arrangement entered into under subsection (a) not later than 45 days after entering into such an arrangement.

(d) In this section, "allied country" means—

(1) a country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or

(2) Australia, New Zealand, Japan, or the Republic of Korea.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 142—PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

Sec.
2411. Definitions.
2412. Purposes.
2413. Cooperative agreements.

2414. Limitation.
2415. Distribution.
2416. Regulations.

§ 2411. Definitions

In this chapter—

(1) "eligible entity" means a State (as defined in section 6302(5) of title 31), a local government (as defined in section 6302(2) of such title), or a private, nonprofit organization that enters into a cooperative agreement with the Secretary under this chapter to furnish procurement technical assistance to business entities and to defray at least one-half of the costs of furnishing such assistance; and

(2) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Defense acting through the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency.

§ 2412. Purposes

The purposes of the program authorized by this chapter are—

(1) to increase Department of Defense assistance for eligible entities furnishing procurement technical assistance to business entities; and

(2) to assit eligible entities in the payment of the costs of establishing and carrying out new procurement technical assistance programs and maintaining existing procurement technical assistance programs.

§ 2413. Cooperative agreements

(a) The Secretary may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

(b) In entering into cooperative agreements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall assure that at least one procurement technical assistance program is carried out in each Department of Defense contract administration services region during each fiscal year.

§ 2414. Limitation

The value of the assistance furnished by the Department of Defense to any eligible entity to carry out a procurement technical assistance program pursuant to a cooperative agreement under this chapter during any fiscal year may not exceed $150,000.

§ 2515. Distribution

(a)(1) During a fiscal year specified in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall reserve the applicable percentage prescribed in paragraph (2), out of funds appropriated to carry out this chapter in such fiscal year, for the purpose of furnishing assistance pursuant to cooperative agreements entered into under section 2414 of this title with eligible entities which have carried out a procurement technical assistance program before such fiscal year. The Secretary may use the remainder of such funds during such fiscal year for the purpose of furnishing assistance pursuant to cooperative agreements entered into under such section with eligible entities which have not carried out a procurement technical assistance program before such fiscal year.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable percentage in fiscal year 1985 is 50 percent and in fiscal year 1986 is 75 percent.

(b) During any fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 1986, the Secretary shall distribute assistance under this chapter in accordance with such cooperative agreements as the Secretary enters into pursuant to section 2414 of this title.

§ 2416. Regulations

The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this chapter.

CHAPTER 157—TRANSPORTATION

* * * * * * *

Sec.

* * * * * * *

2636. Deductions from carriers because of loss or damage to material in transit.
2637. Authorization for use of motor vehicles between domicile and place of work in case of certain officers and officials.

* * * * * * *

§2637. Authorization for use of motor vehicles between domicile and place of work or employment in case of certain officers and officials

Notwithstanding section 1344 of title 31, or any other provision of law, passenger motor vehicles of the United States Government may be used to provide transportation between the domiciles and places of work or employment of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Under Secretaries of Defense.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 37—PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

CHAPTER 1—DEFINITIONS

§ 101. Definitions

In addition to the definitions in sections 1–5 of title 1, for the purposes of this title—

* * * * * * *

(18) "active duty" means full-time duty in the active service of a uniformed service, and includes full-time training duty, annual training duty, *full-time National Guard duty,* and attendance, while in the active service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary concerned;

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 3—BASIC PAY

* * * * * * *

§ 205. Computation: service creditable

* * * * * * *

(e) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2)(F) of this section, a period served by a member of a uniformed service in a reserve component of a uniformed service pursuant to an enlistment under section 511 of title 10, United States Code, before such member begins (1) service on active duty under subsection (b) of such section; or (2) an initial period of active duty for training under subsection (d) of such section may not be counted under this section.

CHAPTER 5—SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

§ 301. Incentive pay: hazardous duty

(a) Subject to regulations prescribed by the President, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay is also entitled to incentive pay, in the amount set forth in subsection (b) or (c) of this seciton, for the performance of hazardous duty required by orders. For the purposes of this subsection, "hazardous duty" means duty—

(1) as an enlisted crew member, as determined by the Secretary concerned, involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flight;

(2) involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flight, not as a crew member under clause (1) of this subsection;

[(3) involving frequent and regular participation in glider flights;**]**

[(4)**]** *(3)* involving parachute jumping as an essential part of military duty;

[(5) involving intimate contact with persons afflicted with leprosy;**]**

[(6)**]** *(4)* involving the demolition of explosive as a primary duty, including training for that duty;

[(7)**]** *(5)* inside a high- or low-pressure chamber;

[(8)**]** *(6)* as a human acceleration or deceleration experimental subject;

[(9)**]** *(7)* as a human test subject in thermal stress experiments;

[(10)**]** *(8)* involving frequent and regular participation in flight operations on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier or of a ship other than an aircraft carrier from which aircraft are launched;

[(11)**]** *(9)* involving frequent and regular exposure to highly toxic pesticides or involving laboratory work that utilizes live dangerous viruses or bacteria;

[(12)**]** *(10)* involving the servicing of aircraft or missiles with highly toxic fuels or propellants *or the testing of aircraft or missile systems (or components of such systems) during which highly toxic fuels or propellants are used; or*

[(13)**]** *(11)* involving frequent and regular participation in aerial flight by an officer (other than a warrant officer) who is serving as an air weapons controller crew member (as defined by the Secretary concerned) aboard an airborne warning and control system aircraft (as designated by such Secretary) and who is not entitled to incentive pay under section 301a of this title.

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) For the performance of the hazardous duty described in clause (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), **[**(10), (11), or (12)**]** *or (10),* of subsection (a) of this section, **[**an officer is entitled to $110 a month and an enlisted member is entitled to $83 a month**]** *a member is entitled to $110 a month.*

(2)(A) For the performance of hazardous duty described in clause **[**(13)**]** *(11)* of subsection (a) of this section, an officer is entitled to monthly incentive pay based upon his years of service as an air weapons controller as follows:

* * * * * * *

§ 301b. Special pay: aviation career officers extending period of active duty

* * * * * * *

(e)(1) An officer who receives special pay for any period under an agreement under this section is not entitled to aviation career incentive pay under section 301a of this title during such period at a rate that exceeds the rate for such pay in effect on September 30, 1981.

[(2) During the period beginning on October 1, 1983, and ending on September 30, 1984, only agreements executed by officers of the Navy or Marine Corps who are pilots may be accepted under this section.**]**

(2) During the period beginning on October 1, 1984, and ending on September 30, 1985, only agreements executed by officers of the Navy may be accepted under this section.

(3) During the period beginning on October 1, 1983, and ending on **[**September 30, 1984,**]** *September 30, 1985,* only an agreement—

* * * * * * *

(f) Special pay may not be paid under this section for an agreement that applies to a period of active duty that begins after **[**September 30, 1984**]** *September 30, 1985.*

§ 302. Special pay: medical officers of the armed forces

(a)(1) **[**An**]** *Except as provided in subsection (i) of this section, an* officer who is an officer of the Medical Corps of the Army or the Navy or an officer of the Air Force designated as a medical officer and who is on active duty under a call or order to active duty for a period of not less than one year is entitled to special pay in accordance with this subsection.

* * * * * * *

(i) The special pay authorized by this section may not be paid to an officer of the Medical Corps of the Army or of the Navy or an officer of the Air Force designated as a medical officer when that officer is a member of that Medical Corps or is designated as a medical officer based upon the qualifications of that officer as a doctor of podiatric medicine.

§ 308. Special pay: reenlistment bonus

* * * * * * *

(g) No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any reenlistment, or voluntary extension of an active-duty enlistment, in the armed forces entered into after [September 30, 1984] *September 30, 1986.*

§ 308a. Special pay: enlistment bonus

* * * * * * *

(c) No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any enlistment or extension of an initial period of active duty in the armed forces made after [September 30, 1984] *September 30, 1986.*

§ 308f. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Army

* * * * * * *

(c) No bonus may be paid under this section with respect to an enlistment in the Army after [September 30, 1984] *September 30, 1986.*

CHAPTER 7—ALLOWANCES

Sec.
[403. Basic allowance for quarters; variable housing allowance.]
403. Basic allowance for quarters.
403a. Variable housing allowance.

§ 402. Basic allowance for subsistence

* * * * * * *

(b) An enlisted member is entitled to the basic allowance for subsistence, on a daily basis, of one of the following types—

(1) when rations in kind are not available;

(2) when permission to mess separately is granted; and

(3) when assigned to duty under emergency conditions where no messing facilities of the United States are available.

The allowance to an enlisted member, when authorized, may be paid in advance for a period of not more than three months. An enlisted member is entitled to the allowance while on an authorized leave of absence, while confined in a hospital, or while performing travel under orders away from his designated post of duty other than field duty or sea duty. The allowance for an enlisted member who is authorized to receive the basic allowance for subsistence under this subsection is at the rate prescribed in accordance with section 1009 of this title. Unless he is entitled to basic pay under chapter 3 of this title, an enlisted member of a reserve component of a uniformed service, or of the National Guard, is entitled, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, to rations in kind, or a part thereof, when the instruction or duty periods, described in section 206(a) of this title, total at least eight hours in a calendar day. *When the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of Transportation may provide an enlisted member who could be provided rations in kind under the preceding sentence with a commutation when rations in kind are not available.*

§ 403. [Basic allowance for quarters; variable housing allowance]

Basic allowance for quarters

(a)[(1)] Except as otherwise provided by law, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters at the monthly rates prescribed in accordance with section 1009 of this title, according to the pay grade in which he is assigned or distributed for basic pay purposes.

[(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (D) of this paragraph, a member of a uniformed service entitled to basic allowance for quarters is entitled to a variable housing allowance under this paragraph whenever assigned to duty in an area of the United States (other than Alaska or Hawaii) which is a high housing cost area with respect to such member. A member with dependents who is assigned to an unaccompanied tour of duty outside the United States is entitled to a variable housing allowance while serving such tour of duty for any period during which the member's dependents reside in an area of the United States which would qualify the member to receive a variable housing allowance under this paragraph if assigned to duty in that area.

[(B) The monthly amount of a variable housing allowance under this paragraph for any member is the difference between (i) the average monthly cost of housing in that area for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade as that member (as determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (j) of this section), and (ii) 115 percent of the amount of the basic allowance for quarters to which that member is entitled.

[(C) For the purposes of this paragraph, an area shall be considered to be a high housing cost area with respect to a member of a uniformed service whenever the average monthly cost of housing in that area for members serving in the same pay grade as that member (as determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (j) of this section) exceeds 115 percent of the amount of the basic allowance for quarters of that member.

[(D) A member of a reserve component is not entitled to a variable housing allowance while on active duty under a call or order to active duty specifying a period of less than 140 days.]

* * * * * * *

§ 403a. Variable housing allowance

(a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, a member of a uniformed service entitled to basic allowance for quarters is entitled to a variable housing allowance under this section whenever assigned to duty in an area of the United States which is a high housing cost area with respect to that member. A member with dependents who is assigned to an unaccompanied tour of duty outside the United States is entitled to a variable housing allowance while serving that tour of duty for any period during which the member's dependents reside in an area of the United States where, if the member were assigned to duty in that area, the member would be entitled to receive a variable housing allowance.

(2) In the case of a member with dependents—

(A) who is assigned to duty inside the United States the location or the circumstances of which make it necessary that his dependents reside at another location; and

(B) whose dependents reside in an area of the United States where, if the member were assigned to duty in that area, the member would be entitled to receive a variable housing allowance at a rate other than the rate to which the member is entitled (if at all) in the area of his duty assignment,

the member may be paid a variable housing allowance as if he were assigned to duty in the area in which his dependents reside if the Secretary concerned determines (under regulations prescribed under subsection (e) of this section) that it would be inequitable to base the member's entitlement to, and amount of, variable housing allowance on the area to which the member is assigned.

(3) In the case of a member with dependents—

(A) who is assigned to an unaccompanied tour of duty in Alaska or Hawaii; and

(B) who would, if his duty station were outside the United States, be entitled to a family separation allowance under section 427(a) of this title;

the member may be paid a variable housing allowance at the rate applicable to a member without dependents serving in the same grade and at the same location. Payment of a variable housing allowance under this paragraph shall be in addition to any allowance or per diem to which the member otherwise may be entitled under this title.

(b) A member of a uniformed service is not entitled to a variable housing allowance—

(1) in the case of a member who makes a change in permanent duty station, for the number of days that travel is authorized between permanent duty stations (under regulations prescribed under subsection (e) of this section);

(2) in the case of a member with dependents, if the member (A) is assigned to unaccompanied personnel housing of the United States (or an unaccompanied personnel housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service) appropriate to his grade, rank, or rating and adequate for himself, and (B) is authorized the basic allowance for quarters at the rate established for a member with dependents solely by reason of a court order requiring the member to pay support for dependents; or

(3) in the case of a member of a reserve component, while on active duty under a call or order to active duty specifying a period of less than 140 days.

(c)(1) The monthly amount of a variable housing allowance under this section for a member of a uniformed service with respect to an area is the difference between (A) the median monthly cost of housing in that area for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade as that member, and (B) 80 percent of the median monthly cost of housing in the United States for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade as that member.

(2) The rates of variable housing allowance shall be reduced as necessary to comply with subsection (d) of this section.

(3) The effective date of any adjustment in rates of variable housing allowance because of a redetermination of median monthly costs of housing under this subsection shall be the same as the effective date of the next increase after such redetermination in the element of compensation for members of the uniformed services specified in section 1009(a)(3) of this title.

(4) For the purposes of this section, an area shall be considered to be a high housing cost area with respect to a member of a uniformed service whenever the median monthly cost of housing in that area for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade as that member exceeds 80 percent of the median monthly cost of housing in the United States for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade as that member.

(5) Any reduction required under paragraph (2) of this subsection and any determination of median monthly costs of housing under this subsection shall be made under regulations prescribed under subsection (e) of this section.

(d)(1) The total amount that may be paid during any fiscal year for the variable housing allowance authorized members of the uniformed services by this section may not exceed the product of—

(A) the total amount paid for such allowance during the preceding fiscal year (as adjusted under paragraph (3) of this subsection); and

(B) a fraction—

(i) the numerator of which is the military housing cost index for October of the preceding fiscal year; and

(ii) the denominator of which is the military housing cost index for October of the fiscal year before the preceding fiscal year.

(2) The military housing cost index is the housing component of the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor), as adjusted under regulations prescribed under subsection (e) of this section. Such regulations may assign weights to the elements of that housing component other than those assigned by the Secretary of Labor in order more appropriately to reflect the distribution of elements of housing costs of members of the uniformed services.

(3) In making a determination under paragraph (1) of this subsection for a fiscal year, the amount paid during the preceding fiscal year for the variable housing allowance shall be adjusted to reflect changes during the year for which the determination is made in the number of members of the uniformed services entitled to variable housing allowance from the number of such members during the preceding fiscal year. Adjustments under this paragraph shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed under subsection (e) of this section.

(e) The President may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

§ 404. Travel and transportation allowances: general

(a) Except as provided in subsection (f) of this section and under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of a uniformed service is entitled to travel and transportation allowances for travel performed or to be performed under orders without regard to the comparative costs of the various modes of transportation—

(1) upon a change of permanent station, or otherwise, or when away from his designated post of duty regardless of the length of time he is away from that post;

(2) upon appointment, call to active duty, enlistment, or induction, from his home or from the place from which called or ordered to active duty to his first station;

(3) upon separation from the service, placement on the temporary disability retired list, release from active duty, or retirement, from his last duty station to his home or the place from which he was called or ordered to active duty, whether or not he is or will be a member of a uniformed service at the time the travel is or will be performed; **[**and**]**

(4) when away from home to perform duty, including duty by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as the case may be, in his status as a member of the National Guard, for which he is entitled to, or has waived, pay under this title **[**.**]***; and*

(5) when attending a reserve training meeting for the purpose of performing duties as an instructor at such meeting ad the member performing such duties is not on active duty and lives 100 or more miles from the place of such meeting.

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, a member who—

(A) is retired, or is placed on the temporary disability retired list, under chapter 61 of title 10; or

(B) is retired with pay under any other law, or, immediately following at least eight years of continuous active duty with no single break therein of more than 90 days, is discharged with *separation pay or* severance pay or is involuntarily released from active duty with *separation pay or* readjustment pay;

may, not later than one year from the date he is so retired, placed on that lisat, discharged, or released, except as prescribed in regulations by the Secretaries concerned, select his home for the purposes of the travel and transportation allowances authorized by subsection (a) of this section.

* * * * * * *

§ 405. Travel and transportation allowances: per diem while on duty outside United States or in Hawaii or Alaska

(a) Without regard to the monetary limitations of this title, the Secretaries concerned may authorize the payment of a per diem, considering all elements of the cost of living to members of the uniformed services under their jurisdiction and their dependents, including the cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses, to such a member who is on duty outside of the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska, whether or not he is in a travel status. However, dependents may not be considered in determining the per diem allowance for a member in a travel status.

(b) A station housing allowance may be prescribed under this section *for a member who is on duty outside of the United States* without regard to costs other than housing costs and may consist of the difference between basic allowance for quarters and applicable housing cost. *A station housing allowance may not be prescribed under this section for a member who is on duty in Hawaii or Alaska.* A station housing allowance prescribed under this section may be paid in advance.

(c) Housing cost and allowance may be disregarded in prescribing a station cost of living allowance under this section.

CHAPTER 9—LEAVE

§ 501. Payments for unused accrued leave

* * * * * * *

(e)(1) A member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration who is discharged under other than honorable conditions forfeits all accrued leave to his credit at the time of his discharge.

(2) A member of a uniformed service who is discharged before completing six months of active duty because of a failure to serve satisfactorily, as determined by the Secretary concerned, forfeits all accrued leave to his credit at the time of discharge.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 19—ADMINISTRATION

§ 1007. Deductions from pay

* * * * * * *

(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, an amount that [an enlisted member of the Army or the Air Force] *a member of the armed forces* is administratively determined to owe the United States or any of its instrumentalities may be deducted from his pay in monthly installments. However, after the deduction of pay forfeited by the sentence of a court-martial, if any, or otherwise authorized by law to be withheld, the deductions authorized by this section may not reduce the pay actually received for any month to less than one-third of his pay for that month.

* * * * * * *

UNITED STATES CODE

TITLE 5—GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES

* * * * * * *

PART III—EMPLOYEES

* * * * * * *

Subpart D—Pay and Allowances

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 53—PAY RATES AND SYSTEMS

* * * * * * *

Subchapter II—Executive Schedule Pay Rates

* * * * * * *

§ 5316. Positions at level V

Level V of the Executive Schedule applies to the following positions, for which the annual rate of basic pay shall be the rate determined with respect to such level under chapter 11 of title 2, as adjusted by section 5318 of this title:

* * * * * * *

Additional officers, Department of Education (4).

[Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents, Department of Education.]

Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 10, ARMED FORCES

Subtitle B—Army

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 337—APPOINTMENTS AS RESERVES OFFICERS

* * * * * * *

§ 3364. Commissioned officers: selection for promotion; order of promotion; zone of consideration list; declination of promotion

* * * * * * *

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a reserve commissioned officer who has been in an inactive status may not be considered for promotion until at least one year after the date on which he is returned to an active status. *However, the Secretary may waive the prohibition contained in the preceding sentence in order to permit consideration for promotion of a reserve general officer who has been transferred to inactive status under section 3375 (2) of this title, but such officer may not be considered for promotion* *under such a waiver more than one year after such officer was transferred to inactive status.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 353—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

§ 3686. Members of Army National Guard of United States: credit for service as members of Army National Guard

For the purposes of laws providing benefits for members of the Army National Guard of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries—

(1) military training, duty, or other service performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the Army National Guard for which he is entitled to pay from the United States shall be considered military training, duty, or other service, as the case may be in Federal service as a Reserve of the Army;

[(2) full-time training or other full-time duty performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the Army National Guard under sections 316 and 502 through 505 of title 32 for which he is entitled to pay from the United States, or for which he has waived such pay, shall be considered active duty for training in Federal service as a Reserve of the Army; and]

(2) full-time National Guard duty performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States shall be deemed to be active duty in Federal service as a Reserve of the Army, except that for purposes of title 38 such duty shall be considered to be active duty for training; and

(3) inactive-duty training performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the Army National Guard, in accordance with regulations prescribed under section 502 of title 32 or other express provision of law, shall be considered inactive-duty training in Federal service as a Reserve of the Army.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 363—SEPARATION OR TRANSFER TO RETIRED RESERVE

* * * * * * *

§ 3855. Retention in active status of certain officers until age 60

Notwithstanding any other section of this chapter except section 3846, the Secretary of the Army may, with the officer's consent, retain in an active status any reserve officer in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Veterinary Corps, [the podiatry specialty in the Medical Allied Sciences Section of the Medical Service Corps,] the Optometry Section of the Medical Service Corps, the Chaplains, the Army Nurse Corps, or the Army Medical Specialist Corps, but not later than the date on which he becomes 60 years of age. An officer may be retained in an active status under the authority of this section only to fill a mission-based requirement.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 369—RETIRED GRADE

* * * * * * *

§ 3964. Higher grade after 30 years of service: Army warrant officers; regular enlisted members

Each warrant officer of the Army, and each enlisted member of the Regular Army, who is retired before or after this title is enacted is entitled, when his active service plus his service on the retired list totals 30 years, to be advanced on the retired list to the highest [temporary] grade in which he served on active duty satisfactorily, as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 403—UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

* * * * * * *

§ 4336. Permanent professors; director of admissions

[(a) A permanent professor of the Academy, other than the Dean of the Academic Board, who is the head of a department of instruction, or who has served as such a professor for more than six years, has the grade of colonel. However, a permanent professor appointed from the Regular Army has the grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as a professor, or after the date when a regular officer, junior to him on the promotion list or active-duty list on which his name was carried before his appointment as a professor is promoted to the regular grade of colonel, whichever is earlier. All other permanent professors have the grade of lieutenant colonel.

[(b) A person appointed as director of admissions of the Academy has the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, and, after he has served six years as director of admissions, has the regular grade of colonel. However, a person appointed from the Regular Army has the regular grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as director of admissions, or after the date when a regular officer, junior to him on the promotion list or active-duty list on which his name was carried before his appointment as director of admissions, is promoted to the regular grade of colonel, whichever is earlier.]

(a) A permanent professor of the Academy, other than the Dean of the Academic Board, who is the head of a department of instruction, or who has served as such a professor for more than six years, has the grade of colonel. However, a permanent professor appointed from the Regular Army has the grade of colonel after the date when

he completes six years of service as a professor, or after the date on which he would have been promoted had he been selected for promotion from among officers in the promotion zone, whichever is earlier.

(b) A person appointed as director of admissions of the Academy has the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, and, after he has served six years as director of admissions, has the regular grade of colonel. However, a person appointed from the Regular Army has the regular grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as director of admissions, or after the date on which he would have been promoted had he been selected for promotion from among officers in the promotion zone, whichever is earlier.

* * * * * * *

§ 4348. Cadets: agreement to serve as officer

(a) Each cadet who is a citizen or national of the United States shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated *from the Army,* he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction at the Academy;

(2) accept an appointment and serve as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force for at least the five years immediately after graduation; and

(3) accept an appointment as a commissioned officer as a Reserve for service in the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve and remain therein until [the sixth anniversary] *at least the sixth anniversary and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, up to the eighth anniversary* of his graduation, if an appointment in the regular component of that armed force is not tendered to him, or if he is permitted to resign as a commissioned officer of that component before that anniversary.

If the cadet is a minor and has parents or a guardian, he may sign the agreement only with the consent of the parents or guardian.

(b) A cadet [who does not fulfill his agreement under subsection](a) *who is separated from the Academy or who declines to accept an appointment and serve as a commissioned officer* may be transferred by the Secretary of the Army to the Army Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade and, notwithstanding section 651 of this title, may be ordered to active duty to serve in that grade for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Navy and Marine Corps

* * * * * * *

PART IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

661. Accountability and Responsibility 7861
663. Names and insignia *7902*

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 544—TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 5721. Temporary promotions of certain Navy lieutenants

* * * * * * *

(f) The authority to make appointments under this section terminates on [September 30, 1984]. *September 30, 1986.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 549—RESERVE PROMOTIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 5891. Officers who may be promoted under this chapter

(a) To be eligible for consideration for promotion by a selection board convened under this chapter, or for promotion under this chapter, an officer must be in active status in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d), a reserve officer who is on the active-duty list maintained under section 620 of this title is ineligible for promotion under this chapter and for consideration by a selection board under this chapter.

(c) A reserve officer who has been recommended for promotion in the approved report of a selection board convened under this chapter, and who is placed on [a lineal list] *the active-duty list* before he is promoted, may be promoted under this chapter, notwithstanding the fact that he is on [a lineal list] *the active-duty list* at the time of promotion.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 575—RECALL TO ACTIVE DUTY

Sec.
[6481. Repealed.]
[6482. Retired enlisted members of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps: authority to recall.]

* * * * * * *

[§ 6482. Retired enlisted members of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps: authority to recall

[In time of war or national emergency the Secretary of the Navy may order to active duty any retired enlisted member of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps.]

* * * * * * *

PART III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 603—UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

§ 6959. Midshipmen: agreement for length of service

(a) Each midshipman who is a citizen or national of the United States shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated *from naval service*, he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction at the Naval Academy;

(2) accept an appointment and serve as a commissioned officer of the Regular Navy, the Regular Marine Corps, or the Regular Air Force for at least five years immediately after graduation; and

(3) accept an appointment as a commissioned officer in the reserve component of the Navy or the Marine Corps or as a Reserve in the Air Force for service in the Air Force Reserve and remain therein until [the sixth anniversary] *at least the sixth anniversary and, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, up to the eighth anniversary* of his graduation if an appointment in the regular component of that armed force is not tendered to him or if he is permitted to resign as a commissioned officer of that component before that anniversary.

If the midshipment is a minor and has parents or a guardian, he may sign the agreement only with the consent of the parents or guardian.

(b) A midshipman [who does not fulfill his agreement under subsection (a)] *who is separated from the Naval Academy or who declines to accept an appointment and serve as a commissioned officer* may be transferred by the Secretary of the Navy to the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade or rating, and, notwithstanding section 651 of this title, may be ordered to active duty to serve in that grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.

* * * * * * *

§ 6961. Midshipmen: dismissal for best interests of the service

(a) Whenever the Superintendent of the Naval Academy believes that the continued presence of any midshipman at the Academy is contrary to the best interest of the service, he shall report in writing to the Secretary of the Navy a full statement of the facts upon which is belief is based. If the Secretary determines from the report that the Superintendent's belief is well founded, the Secretary shall serve a copy of the report on the midshipman. Within such time as the Secretary considers reasonable, the midshipman shall show cause in writing why he should not be dismissed from the Academy. The Secretary, after consideration of any cause so shown, and with the written approval of the President, may dismiss the midshipman from the Academy [and from the naval service] *or from both the Academy and the naval service.*

(b) The truth of any issue of fact raised under subsection (a), except as to the record of demerits, shall be determined by a court of inquiry convened by the Secretary.

§ 6962. Midshipmen: discharge for unsatisfactory conduct or inaptitude

(a) The Superintendent of the Naval Academy shall submit to the Secretary of the Navy in writing a full report of the facts—

(1) whenever the Superintendent determines that the conduct of a midshipman is unsatisfactory; or

(2) whenever the Academic Board unanimously determines that midshipman possesses insufficient aptitude to become a commissioned officer in the naval service.

(b) A midshipman upon whom a report is made under subsection (a) shall be given an opportunity to examine the report and submit a written statement thereon. If the Secretary believes, on the basis of the report and statement, that the determination of the Superintendent or of the Academic Board is reasonable and well founded, he may discharge the midshipman from the [Naval Academy and] *Naval Academy or* from the naval service.

§ 6963. Midshipmen: discharge for deficiency

Midshipmen found deficient at any examination shall, unless the Academic Board recommends otherwise, be discharged from the Naval Academy [and from the naval service] *or from both the Academy and the naval service.*

* * * * * * *

PART IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Chap. Sec.

* * * * * * *

661. Accountability and Responsibility 7861
663. Names and insignia *7902*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 649—QUARTERS, UTILITIES, AND RELATED SERVICES

* * * * * * *

§ 7572. Quarters: accommodations in place of for members on sea duty

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) Under such regulations as the Secretary prescribes, a member of a uniformed service on sea duty who is deprived of quarters on board ship because of repairs or because of other conditions that make the member's quarters uninhabitable and for whom it is impracticable to furnish accommodations under subsection (a) may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in obtaining quarters in an amount not more than the total of—

(A) the basic allowance for quarters payable to a member of the same pay grade without dependents for the period during which the member is deprived of quarters on board ship; and

(B) the variable housing allowance that could be paid to a member of the same pay grade under [section 403] *403a* of title 37 at the location where the member is deprived of quarters onboard ship for the period during which the member is deprived of quarters on board ship.

(2) A member entitled to receipt of basic allowance for quarters may not be reimbursed for expenses under this subsection when deprived of quarters on board ship at a location at which the member can reside with such member's dependents.

(3) The total amount of reimbursement under this subsection may not exceed $9,000,000 for fiscal year 1981, $6,300,000 for fiscal year 1982, $1,700,000 for fiscal year 1983, [and] $1,300,000 for fiscal year 1984, *and $1,421,000 for fiscal year 1985.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 663—NAMES AND INSIGNIA

Sec.
7902. Unauthorized use of Marine Corps insignia.

§ 7902. Unauthorized use of Marine Corps insignia

(a) The seal, emblem, and initials of the United States Marine Corps shall be deemed to be an insignia of the United States.

(b) No person may, except with the written permission of the Secretary of the Navy, use or imitate the seal, emblem, name, or initials of the United States Marine Corps in connection with any promotion, goods, services, or commercial activity in a manner reasonably tending to suggest that such use is approved, endorsed, or authorized by the Marine Corps or any other component of the Department of Defense.

(c) Whenever it appears to the Attorney General of the United States that any person is engaged or is about to engage in an act or practice which constitutes or will constitute conduct prohibited by subsection (b), the Attorney General may initiate a civil proceeding in a district court of the United States to enjoin such act or practice. Such court may, at any time before final determination, enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or take such other action as is warranted, to prevent injury to the United States or to any person or class of persons for whose protection the action is brought.

Subtitle D—Air Force

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 853—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

§ 8686. Members of Air National Guard of United States: credit for service as members of Air National Guard

For the purposes of laws providing benefits for members of the Air National Guard of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries—

(1) military training, duty, or other service performed by a member of the Air National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the Air National Guard for which he is entitled to pay from the United States shall be considered military training, duty, or other service, as the case may be, in Federal service as a Reserve of the Air Force;

[(2) full-time training or other full-time duty performed by a member of the Air National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the Air National Guard under sections 316 and 502 through 505 of title 32 for which he is entitled to pay from the United States, or for which he has waived such pay, shall be considered active duty for training in Federal service as a Reserve of the Air Force; and]

(2) full-time National Guard duty performed by a member of the Air National Guard of the United States shall be deemed to be active duty in Federal service as a Reserve of the Air Force, except that for purposes of title 38 such duty shall be considered to be active duty for training; and

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 863—SEPARATION OR TRANSFER TO RETIRED RESERVE

* * * * * * *

§ 8855. Retention in active status of certain officers until age 60

Notwithstanding any other section of this chapter except section 8846, the Secretary of the Air Force may, with the officer's consent, retain in an active status any reserve officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer, dental officer, veterinary officer, optometrist, [podiatrist,] chaplain, Air Force nurse, or biomedical science officer, but not later than the date upon which he becomes 60 years of age. An officer may be retained in an active status under the authority of this section only to fill a mission-based requirement.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 869—RETIRED GRADE

* * * * * * *

§ 8964. Higher grade after 30 years of service: Air Force warrant officers; regular enlisted members

Each warrant officer of the Air Force, and each enlisted member of the Regular Air Force, who is retired before or after this title is enacted is entitled, when his active service plus his service on the retired list totals 30 years, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade that is equal to the highest [temporary] grade in which he served on active duty satisfactorily, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 903—UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

§ 9336. Permanent professors; registrar

[(a) A permanent professor of the Academy, other than the Dean of the Faculty, who is the head of a department of instruction, or who has served as such a professor for more than six years, has the grade of colonel. However, a permanent professor appointed from the Regular Air Force has the grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as a professor, or after the date when a regular officer, junior to him on the promotion list or active-duty list on which his name was carried before his appointment as a professor, is promoted to the regular grade of colonel, whichever is earlier. All other permanent professors have the grade of lieutenant colonel.

[(b) A person appointed as registrar of the Academy has the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, and, after he has served six years as registrar, has the regular grade of colonel. However, a person appointed from the Regular Air Force has the regular grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as registrar, or after the date when a regular officer, junior to him on the promotion list or active-duty list on which his name was carried before his appointment as registrar, is promoted to the regular grade of colonel, whichever is earlier.]

(a) A permanent professor of the Academy, other than the Dean of the Faculty, who is the head of a department of instruction, or who has served as such a professor for more than six years, has the grade of colonel. However, a permanent professor appointed from the Regular Air Force has the grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as a professor, or after the date on which he would have been promoted had he been selected for promotion from among officers in the promotion zone, whichever is earlier.

(b) A person appointed as registrar of the Academy has the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, and, after he has served six years as registrar, has the regular grade of colonel. However, a person appointed from the Regular Air Force has the regular grade of colonel after the date when he completes six years of service as registrar, or after the date on which he would have been promoted had he been selected for promotion from among officers in the promotion zone, whichever is earlier.

§ 9384. Cadets: agreement to serve as officer

(a) Each cadet who is a citizen or national of the United States shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated *from the Air Force,* he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction at the Academy;

(2) accept an appointment and serve as a commissioned officer of the Regular Air Force for at least the five years immediately after graduation; and

(3) accept an appointment as a commissioned officer as a Reserve for service in the Air Force Reserve and remain therein until [the sixth anniversary] *at least the sixth anniversary and, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, up to the eight anniversary* of his graduation, if an appointment in the Regular Air Force is not tendered to him, or if he is permitted to resign as a commissioned officer of that component before that anniversary.

If the cadet is a minor and has parents or a guardian, he may sign the agreement only with the consent of the parents or guardian.

(b) A cadet [who does not fulfill his agreement under subsection (a)] *who is separated from the Academy or who declines to accept an appointment and serve as a commissined officer* may be transfered by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Air Force Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade and, notwithstanding section 561 of this title, may be ordered to active duty to serve in that grade for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.

TITLE 20—EDUCATION

CHAPTER 25A—OVERSEAS DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION

Sec.

921. Defense dependents education system; establishment; program purposes and activities.
922. Office of Dependents' Education.
    (a) Establishment; appointment, etc., of Director.
    (b) Implementation of program functions of Secretary of Defense through Director.
    (c) Functions of directors.
    (d) Establishment of regional or area offices; organizational, etc., report to Congress; authorized number of civilian employees.
923. Tuition-paying students.
    (a) Enrollment of ineligible child in system school.
    (b) Determination of amount of tuition; use of payments.
    (c) Regulations respecting enrollment requirements.
924. Annual educational assessment; contents; available.
925. Budget request for school construction funds for Director of Dependents' Education.
926. School system for dependents in overseas areas; establishment and operation; tuition payment requirements for attendance in schools outside of system.
927. Allotment formula.
    (a) Establishment by regulation of minimum allotment formula; criteria.
    (b) Issuance, etc., of regulations.
    (c) Applicability of provisions respecting education of handicapped children to program operation.
928. School advisory committees.
    (a) Establishment; functions; membership.
    (b) Election of members; regulations respecting qualifications and election procedures.
    (c) Members to serve without pay.
929. Advisory Council of Dependents' Education.
    (a) Establishment; membership; Director.
    (b) Terms of office of members.
    (c) Meeings; functions.
    (d) Compensation, etc., of members.
    (e) Termination.
930. Study of defense dependents' education system.

(a) Scope; conduct and report to Director by contractor.
(b) Consultation requirements respecting study specifications and contractor selection.
(c) Reporting requirements of Director.
(d) Additional studies authorized by Director; conduct, reports, etc.
931. Regulations; issuance and contents.
932. Definitions.

§ 921. Defense dependents' education system; establishment; program purposes and activities

(a) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and operate a program (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "defense dependents' education system") to provide a free public education through secondary school for dependents in overseas areas.

* * * * * * *

(c) The Secretary of Defense may request the Secretary of Education to provide information, advice, and technical support concerning educational programs and practices.

* * * * * * *

§ 928. School advisory committees

(a) Establishment; functions; membership

(1) The Director shall provide for the establishment of an advisory committee for each school in the defense dependents' education system. An advisory committee for a school shall advise the principal or superintendent of the school with respect to the operation of the school, may make recommendations with respect to curriculum and budget matters, and, except as provided under paragraph (2), shall advise the local military commander with respect to problems concerning dependents' education within the jurisdiction of the commander. The membership of each such advisory committee shall include an equal number of parents of students enrolled in the school and of employees working at the school and, when appropriate, may include a student enrolled in the school.

(2) In the case of any military installation or overseas area where there is more than one school in the defense dependents' education system, the Director shall provide for the establishment of an advisory committee for such military installation or overseas area to advise the local military commander with respect to problems concerning dependents' education within the jurisdiction of the commander.

(b) Election of members; regulations respecting qualifications and election procedures

Members of a school advisory committee established under this section shall be elected by individuals of voting age residing in the area to be served by the advisory committee. [The Secretary of

Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense,] *The Secretary of Defense* shall by regulation prescribe the qualifications for election to an advisory committee and procedures for conducting elections of advisory committee members.

(c) Members to serve without pay

Members of school advisory committees established under this section shall serve without pay.

§ 929. Advisory Council on Dependents' Education

[**(a) Establishment; membership; Director**

There is established in the Department of Education an Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of—

[(1) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics, and the Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents of such department, who shall be cochairman of the Council;

[(2) twelve individuals appointed by the Secretary of Education, who shall be individuals who have demonstrated an interest in the fields of primary or secondary education and who shall include representatives of professional employee organizations, school administrators, parents of dependents enrolled in the dependents' education system, and one student enrolled in such system;

[(3) a representative of the Secretary of Education and of the Secretary of Defense.

The Director shall be the Executive Secretary of the Council.]

(a)(1) There is established in the Department of Defense an Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of—

(A) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Assistant Secretary"), who shall be the Chairman of the Council;

(B) twelve individuals appointed by the Assistant Secretary, who shall be individuals who have demonstrated an interest in the field of primary or secondary education and who shall include representatives of professional employee organizations, school administrators, sponsors of students enrolled in the defense dependents' education system, and one student enrolled in such system.

(C) representatives from overseas military commands and from educational institutions as designated by the Assistant Secretary; and

(D) an individual appointed by the Secretary of Education.

(2) The Director shall be the Executive Secretary of the Council.

(b) Terms of office of members

The term of office of each member of the Council appointed under subsection (a)(2) of this section shall be three years, except that—

(1) of the members first appointed under such paragraph, four shall serve for a term of one year, four shall serve for a term of two years, and four shall serve for a term of three years, as determined by the [Secretary of Education] *Assistant Secretary* at the time of their appointment, and

(2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remained of such term.

No member appointed under subsection (a)(2) of this section shall serve more than two full terms on the Council.

(c) Meeting; functions

The Council shall meet [at least four times each year] *not more than four times each year. The functions of the Council shall be to—*

(1) recommend to the Director general policies for operation of the defense dependents' education system with respect to curriculum selection, administration, and operation of the system,

[(2) make recommendations to the Director and to the Secretary of Education on the orderly transfer of the functions under this chapter to the Secretary and Department of Education.]

[(3)] *(2)* provide information to the Director from other Federal agencies concerned with primary and secondary education with respect to education programs and practices which such agencies have found to be effective and which should be considered for inclusion in the defense dependents' education system,

[(4)] *(3)* advise the Director on the design of the study and the selection of the contractor referred to in section 930(a)(2) of this title, and

[(5)] *(4)* perform such other tasks as may be required by the [Secretary of Education] *Assistant Secretary.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 48—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

* * * * * * *

Subchapter II—Etablishment of the Department

Sec.

* * * * * * *

3417. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.
[3418. Office of Education for Overseas Dependents.]

* * * * * * *

Subchapter III—Transfers of Agencies and Functions

3441. Transfers from Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
  (a) Functions transferred to Secretary.
  (b) Offices, etc., transferred to Department.
  (c) Administrative functions transferred to Secretary.
  (d) Reservation of functions relating to Project Head Start.
[3442. Transfers from Department of Defense.
  (a) Functions relating to operation of overseas schools for and education of dependents.
  (b) Functions relating to personnel.
  (c) Effectuation of tranfers.
  (d) Operation of overseas institutions of higher education.]
3443. Transfers from Department of Labor.

* * * * * * *

§ 3412. Principal officers

* * *

[(e) Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents

[There shall be in the Department an Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents.]

* * * * * * *

[§ 3418. Office of Education for Overseas Dependents

[There shall be in the Department an Office of Education for Overseas Dependents, to be administered by the Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents appointed under section 3412(e) of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3472 of this title, the Secretary shall delegate to the Administrator all functions, other than administrative and support functions, transferred to the Secretary under section 342 of this title.]

* * * * * * *

[§ 3442. Transfers from Department of Defense

[(a) Functions relating to operation of overseas schools for an education of dependents

[Notwithstanding the provisions of section 601 of this Act, at such time not later than three years after May 4, 1980, and in such manner, as the President may designate, there shall be transferred to the Secretary all functions of the Secretary of Defense and of the Department of Defense (or any officer or component thereof) relating to the operation of overseas schools for dependents of the Department of Defense and all functions of the Secretary of Defense and of the Department of Defense (or any officer or component thereof) under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 [20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.]. There shall be transferred to the Department the offices established by such Act.

[(b) Functions relating to personnel

[In addition to any other authority available to the Secretary under this chapter or any other Act, the authority of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act [20 U.S.C. 901 et seq.] shall be available to the Secretary with respect to the functions transferred under subsection (a) of this section.

[(c) Effectuation of transfers

[Not later than one year after May 4, 1980, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall transmit to the Congress a plan for effecting the transfer of functions under this section and administering those functions. In designing the plan, the Secretary shall also consult with representatives of organizations of parents of students enrolled in overseas dependents' schools and representatives of professional employee organizations and administrators of such schools. The plan shall contain recommendations for increasing the participation of parents, teachers, students, school administrators, and members of the Armed Forces in the administration and operation of the schools transferred under this section.

[(d) Operation of overseas institutions of higher education

[Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to give the Secretary authority to operate overseas institutions of higher education.]

* * * * * * *

§ 3461. Office and employees

* * *

[(f) Civilian components

[For purposes of any status of forces agreement between the United States and any other country or any international organization, any reference to "civilian component" shall be deemed to include a reference to overseas personnel of the overseas dependents' education system.]

* * * * * * *

§ 3474. Rules and regulations

(a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as the Secretary determines necessary or appropriate to administer and manage the functions of the Secretary or the Department.

(b) The Secretary, in promulgating rules and regulations as authorized by statute, shall prescribe such rules and regulations in accordance with chapter 5 of Title 5. Section 1232 of this title also shall apply to such rules and regulations to the extent applicable immediately prior to the effective date of this chapter, and to rules and regulations promulgated with respect to programs transferred under sections 3441(a) (1), (2), and (4), [3442,] 3443, 3444, 3445, and 3446 of this title.

* * * * * * *

§ 3479. Use of facilities

(a) Federal, State, local and foreign government facilities; functions of Department of Defense

[(1)] With their consent, the Secretary may, with or without reimbursement, use the research, equipment, services, and facilities of any agency or instrumentality of the United States, of any State or political subdivision thereof, or of any foreign government, in carrying out any function of the Secretary or the Department.

[(2) Notwithstanding the transfer of functions from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary under section 3442 of this title (and the consequent transfer of personnel), all personnel performing such functions shall be treated, for the purpose of access to services and facilities provided by the Department of Defense, as employees of the Department of Defense.]

* * * * * * *

§ 3503. Agency terminations

(a) [(1)] On May 4, 1980, the following entities shall terminate:

(A) the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including the Office of Education;

(B) the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare;

(C) the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[(2) Whenever the President exercises the authority under section 3442(a) of this title, the Office of Dependents' Education of the Department of Defense shall terminate.]

(b) Each position which was expressly authorized by law, or the incumbent of which was authorized to receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV or V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315–5316), in an office terminated pursuant to this chapter shall also terminate.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 32—NATIONAL GUARD

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1—ORGANIZATION

* * * * * * *

§ 101. Definitions

In addition to the definitions in sections 1–5 of title 1, the following definitions apply in this title:

* * * * * * *

(12) "Active duty" means full-time duty in the active military service of the United States. It includes such Federal duty as full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned. *It does not include full-time National Guard duty.*

* * * * * * *

(19) "Full-time National Guard duty" means training or other duty, other than inactive duty, performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States in the member's status as a member of the National Guard of a State or territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia under section 316, 502, 503, 504, or 505 of this title for which the member is entitled to pay from the United States or for which the member has waived pay from the United States.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 3—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

Sec.
[334. Repealed.]
[335. Status of certain members performing full-time duty.]

* * * * * * *

[§ 335. Status of certain members performing full-time duty

[Members of the National Guard serving in a full-time duty status for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the National Guard shall be entitled to all rights, privileges, and benefits of members called to active duty under section 265 of title 10 and shall be considered to be serving on active duty for purposes of sections 524(a) and 976 of such title.]

TITLE 38—VETERANS' BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

PART III—READJUSTMENT AND RELATED BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 34—VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

* * * * * * *

Subchapter III—Entitlement; Duration

* * * * * * *

§ 1662. Time limitations for completing a program of education

[(e) No educational assistance shall be afforded any eligible veteran under this chapter or chapter 36 of this title after December 31, 1989.]

(e) Any educational assistance afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter or chapter 36 of this title after December 31, 1989, shall be paid for from funds appropriated to the Department of Defense.

TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 7—SOCIAL SECURITY

* * * * * * *

Subchapter XVIII—Health Insurance for Aged and Disabled

* * * * * * *

PART C—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 1395cc. Agreements with providers of services

(a) Filing of agreement; eligibility for payment; charges with respect to items and services

(1) Any provider of services (except a fund designated for purposes of section 1395f(g) and section 1395n(e) of this title) shall be qualified to participate under this subchapter and shall be eligible for payments under this subchapter if it files with the Secretary an agreement—

* * * * * * *

(G) in the case of hospitals which provide inpatient hospital services for which payment may be made under subsection (b) or (d) of section 1395ww of this title, not to charge any individual or any other person for inpatient hospital services for which such individual would be entitled to have payment made under part A but for a denial or reduction of payments under section 1395ww(f)(2) of this title, [and]

(H) in the case of hospitals which provide inpatient hospital services for which payment may be made under this subchapter, to have all items and services (other than physicians' services as defined in regulations for purposes of section 1395y(a)(14) of this title) (i) that are furnished to an individual who is an inpatient of the hospital, and (ii) for which the individual is entitled to have payment made under this subchapter, furnished by the hospital or otherwise under arrangements (as defined in section 1395x(w)(1) of this title) made by the hospital **[**.**]** and

(I) in case of hospitals, to furnish (or have furnished under arrangements), under a plan administered under section 1079 or 1086 of title 10, United States Code, to beneficiaries under the plan such items and services furnished by the hospital (or by others under arrangements with the hospital) to its other patients as the plan may specify, and to accept as payment in full for those items and services the amounts that would be payable under this title (including the amounts of any coinsurance or deductibles under this title) if those items and services were covered services under this title.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 50—WAR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

APPENDIX

EMERGENCY AND POST-WAR LEGISLATION

* * * * * * *

MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

* * * * * * *

§ 456. Deferments and exemptions from training and service

* * * * * * *

(o) Except during the period of a war or a national emergency declared by Congress, no person may be inducted for training and service under this title [sections 451 to 471a of this Appendix] unless he volunteers for such induction—

(1) if the father *or the mother* or a brother or a sister of such person was killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces after December 31, 1959, or died subsequent to such date as a result of injuries received or disease incurred in line of duty during such service, or

(2) during any period of time in which the father *or the mother* or a brother or a sister of such person is in a captured or missing status as a result of such service.

As used in this subsection the term "brother" or "sister" means a brother of the whole blood or a sister of the whole blood, as the case may be.

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1984

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 794. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for the procurement of a weapon system unless the prime contractor or other contractors for such system provides the United States with written guarantees—

[(1) that the system and each component thereof were designed and manufactured so as to conform to the Government's performance requirements as specifically delineated (A) in the production contract, or (B) in any other agreement relating to the production of such system entered into by the United States and the contractor;

[(2) that the system and each component thereof, at the time they are provided to the United States, are free from all defects (in materials and workmanship) which would cause the system to fail to conform to the Government's performance requirements as specifically delineated (A) in the production contract, or (B) in any other agreement relating to the production of such system entered into by the United States and the contractor; and

[(3) that, in the event of a failure of the weapon system or a component to meet the conditions specified in clauses (1) and (2)—

[(A) the contractor will bear the cost of all work promptly to repair or replace such parts as are necessary to achieve the required performance requirements; or

[(B) if the contractor fails to repair or replace such parts promptly, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, the contractor will pay the costs incurred by the United States in procuring such parts from another source.

[(b) A written guarantee provided pursuant to subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any weapon system or component thereof which has been furnished by the Government to a contractor.

[(c) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of subsection (a) in the case of a weapon system if the Secretary—

[(1) determines that the waiver is necessary in the interest of the national defense or would not be cost-effective; and

[(2) notifies the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives in writing of his intention to waive such requirements with respect to such weapon system and includes in the notice an explanation of the reasons for the waiver.

[(d) The requirements for written guarantees provided in subsection (a) hereof shall apply only to contracts which are awarded after the date of enactment of this Act and shall not cover combat damage.]

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1984

* * * * * * *

TITLE IX—MILITARY COMPENSATION AND HEALTH CARE MATTERS

Part A—Pay and Allowances

* * * * * * *

Sec. 906. During [fiscal year 1984] *the period beginning on October 1, 1983, and ending on January 1, 1985,* the rates at which the variable housing allowance under section 403(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is paid shall be the same as the rates in effect on September 30, 1983.

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1983

* * * * * * *

TITLE XI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

CONTINUATION OF TEST PROGRAM TO AUTHORIZE PRICE DIFFERENTIAL TO RELIEVE ECONOMIC DISLOCATIONS

Sec. 1109. (a) The Secretary of Defense should conduct a test program during [fiscal years 1983 and 1984] *fiscal years 1984 and 1985* in accordance with this subsection to test the effect of exempting certain contracts of the Department of Defense from the provisions of section 2892 of title 10, United States Code, and paying a price differential under such contracts for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations. Under such test program, the Secretary of Defense may exempt from the provisions of such section any contract (other than a contract for the purchase of fuel) made by the Defense Logistics Agency during [fiscal years 1983 and 1984] *fiscal years 1984 and 1985* if the contract is to be awarded to an individual or firm located in a Labor Surplus Area (as defined and identified by the Department of Labor) and if the Secretary determines—

(1) that the awarding of such contract will not adversely affect the national security of the United States;

(2) that there is a reasonable expectation that bids will be received from a sufficient number of responsible bidders so that the award of such contract will be made at reasonable cost to the United States;

(3) that the price differential to be paid under such contract will not exceed 2.2 percent; and

(4) the value of such contract, when added to the cumulative value of all other contracts awarded under the test program authorized by this section, will not exceed $4,000,000,000.

(b) Not later than April 15, 1983 [and April 15, 1984,], *April 15, 1984, and April 15, 1985,* the President shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation and results to that date of the test program authorized by subsection (a). The report shall include an assessment of the costs and benefits of the test program.

[PROHIBITION AGAINST CONSOLIDATING FUNCTIONS OF THE MILITARY TRANSPORTATION COMMANDS

[SEC. 1110. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this or any other Act may be used for the purpose of consolidating any of the functions being performed on the date of the enactment of this Act by the Military Traffic Management Command of the Army, the Military Sealift Command of the Navy, or the Military Airlift Command of the Air Force with any function being performed on such date by either or both of the other commands.]

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1982

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 103. (a) During [fiscal year 1984] *fiscal year 1985*, the Secretary of Defense, in carrying out the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding Between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Ministers of Defence on the NATO E-3A Cooperative Programme, signed by the Secretary of Defense on December 6, 1978, may—

(1) waive reimbursement for the cost of the following functions performed by personnel other than personnel employed in the United States Air Force Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) program office:

(A) auditing;
(B) quality assurance;
(C) codification;
(D) inspection;
(E) contract administration;
(F) acceptance testing;
(G) certification services; and
(H) planning, programing, and management services;

(2) waive any surcharge for administrative services otherwise chargeable; and

(3) in connection with the NATO E-3A Cooperative Programme for [fiscal year 1984] *fiscal year 1985*, assume contingent liability for—

(A) program losses resulting from the gross negligence of any contracting officer of the United States;

(B) identifiable taxes, customs duties, and other charges levied within the United States on the program; and

(C) the United States share of the unfunded termination liability.

(b) Authority under this section to enter into contracts shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC LAW 96-357

SEC. 3. Effective only for the period beginning October 1, 1980, and ending [September 30, 1984] *September 30, 1985,* section 7572(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to accommodations in place of quarters for members on sea duty, is amended to read as follows:

* * * * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1983

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—ACTIVE FORCES

* * * * * * *

LIMITATION ON ENLISTMENT AND INDUCTION OF PERSONS INTO THE ARMED FORCES WHOSE SCORE ON THE ARMED FORCES QUALIFICATION TEST IS BELOW A PRESCRIBED LEVEL

SEC. 302. (a) The number of male individuals (with no prior military service) enlisted or inducted into the Army during the fiscal year beginning on [October 1, 1983] *October 1, 1984,* who are not high school graduates may not exceed, as of [September 30, 1984] *September 30, 1985,* 35 percent of all male individuals (with no prior military service) enlisted or inducted into the Army during such fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 32—OFFICER STRENGTH AND DISTRIBUTION IN GRADE

Sec.
521. Authority to prescribe total strengths of officers on active duty and officer strengths in various categories.
522. Authorized total strengths: regular commissioned officers on active duty.
523. Authorized strengths: commissioned officers on active duty in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and Navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain.
[524. Authoriyed strengths: reserve officers on active duty for administration of the reserves in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and Navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander and captain.]
524. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and Navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain.
525. Distribution of commissioned officers on active duty in general officer and flag officer grades.
526. Authority to suspend sections 523, 524, and 525.

* * * * * * *

§ 523. Authorized strengths: commissioned officers on active duty in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain

* * * * * * *

(b) Officers in the following categories shall be excluded in computing and determining authorized strengths under this section:

(1) Reserve officers—

(A) on active duty for training;

(B) on active duty under section 265, 3033, 3496, 5251, 5252, 8033, or 8496 of this title or under section 708 of title 32;

(C) on active duty under section 672(d) of this title [,or section 502 or 503 of title 32] in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components;

(D) on active duty to pursue special work; [or]

(E) ordered to active duty under section 673b of this title[.] *or*

(F) on full-time National Guard duty.

* * * * * * *

[§ 524. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty for administration of the reserves in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and Navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain]

§ 524. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard in grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel and Navy grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain

(a) The number of reserve officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps who may be on active duty *or full-time National Guard duty* in each of the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, and of the Navy who may be on active duty in each of the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain, as of the end of any fiscal year for duty described in subclauses (B) and (C) of section 523(b)(1) of this title *or full-time National Guard duty (other than for training) under section 502(f) of title 32* may not exceed the number for that grade and armed force in the following table:

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or Lieutentant Commander	1,948	823	408	95
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	967	520	303	48
Colonel or Navy Captain	338	177	171	23

(b) Whenever the number of officers serving in any grade is less than the number authorized for that grade under this section, the difference between the two numbers may be applied to increase the number authorized under this section for any lower grade.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 55—MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

* * * * * * *

§ 1079. Contracts for medical care for spouses and children: plans

(a) To assure that medical care is available for spouses and children of members of the uniformed services who are on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, the Secretary of Defense, after consulting with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall contract, under the authority of this section for medical care for those persons under such insurance, medical service, or health plans as he considers appropriate. The type of health care authorized under this section shall be the same as those provided under section 1976 of this title except that—

(1) with respect to dental care, only that care required as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment may be provided;

(2) routine physical examinations and immunizations of defendents over two years of age may only be provided when required in the case of dependents who are traveling outside the United States as a result of a members's duty assignment and such travel is being performed under orders issued by a uniformed service;

[(3) eye examinations may not be provided;]

(3) not more than one eye examination may be provided to a dependent in any calendar year;

(4) under joint regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the services of Christian Science practitioners and nurses and services obtained in Christian Science sanatoriums may be provided;

(5) durable equipment, such as wheelchairs, iron lungs and hospital beds may be provided on a rental basis; [and]

(6) inpatient mental health services may not (except as provided in subsection (i)) be provided to a patient in excess of 60 days in any year [.]*;*

(7) chiropractic care which shall include manual manipulation of the spine and such other routine chiropractic procedures as are authorized under joint rgulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services and are not otherwise prohibited by law;

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 74—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY RETIREMENT FUND

* * * * * * *

§ 1464. Board of Actuaries

(a)(1) There is established in the Department of Defense a Department of Defense Retirement Board of Actuaries (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "Board"). [The Board shall consist of three members, who shall be appointed by the President from among qualified professional actuaries who are members of the Society of Actuaries.] The Board shall consist of three members who shall be appointed by the President from among individuals enrolled by the Joint Board of the Enrollment of Actuaries established under subtitle C of title III of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1241-1242).

TITLE 10—ARMED FORCES

§ 2306. Kinds of contracts

(f)(1) A prime contractor or any subcontractor shall be required to submit cost or pricing data under the circumstances listed below, and shall be required to certify that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the cost or pricing data he submitted was accurate, complete and current—

(A) prior to the award of any negotiated prime contract under this title where the price is expected to exceed [$500,000;] *$100,000;*

(B) prior to the pricing of any contract change or modification for which the price adjustment is expected to exceed [$500,000,] *$100,000,* or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the head of the agency;

(C) prior to the award of a subcontract at any tier, where the prime contractor and each higher tier subcontractor have been required to furnish such a certificate, if the price of such subcontract is expected to exceed [$500,000;] *$100,000;* or

(D) prior to the pricing of any contract change or modification to a subcontract covered by clause (C), for which the price adjustment is expected to exceed [$500,000,] *$100,000,* or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the head of the agency.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 141—MISCELLANEOUS PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 2384a. Supplies: economic order quantities

(a)(1) An agency referred to in section 2303(a) of this title shall procure supplies in such quantity as (A) will result in the total cost and unit cost most advantageous to the United States, where practicable, and (B) does not exceed the quantity reasonably expected to be required by the agency during a fiscal year or longer period for which an appropriation is available for the purpose of procuring such supplies.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall take paragraph (1) into account in approving rates of obligation of appropriations under section 2204 of this title.

(b) Each solicitation for a supply contract shall include a clause requesting each contractor responding to the solicitation to state an opinion on whether the quantity of the supplies proposed to be procured is economically advantageous to the United States and, if applicable, to recommend two quantities which would be more economically advantageous to the United States. Each such recommendation shall include a quotation of the total price and the unit price for supplies procured in each recommended quantity.

* * * * * * *

§ 2402. Prohibition of contractors limiting subcontractor sales directly to the United States

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), each contract for the purchase of supplies or services made by the Department of Defense shall provide that the contractor will not—

(1) enter into any agreement with a subcontractor under the contract that has the effect of restricting sales by the subcontractor directly to the United States of any item or process (including computer software) like those made, or services like those furnished, by the subcontractor under the contract (or any follow-on production contract); or

(2) otherwise act to restrict the ability of a subcontractor to make sales to the United States described in clause (1).

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 137—PROCUREMENT GENERALLY

* * * * * * *

§ 2318. Planning for future competition

(a) To encourage the competitive acquisition of supplies and services to support and maintain a major system during its service life, the head of the agency with responsibility for that system shall ensure the following:

(1) That in any competitive solicitation for the award of any development contract for a major system, the following shall be included as evaluation factors, giving due consideration to the purposes for which the system is being procured and the technology to achieve the system's required capabilities:

(A) Proposals to incorporate in the design of the major system components that are currently available within the supply system of the agency responsible for the major system, available elsewhere in the national supply system, or commercially available from more than one source.

(B) Proposals to incorporate in the design of the major system components that are likely to be required in substantial quantities during the system's service life and will permit future competitive acquisitions by the Government.

(2) That in any competitive solicitation for the award of any production contract for a major system, the following shall be included as evaluation factors:

(A) Proposals to identify components in the system that are likely to be required in substantial quantities during the system's service life and whether the technical data for such components will permit future competitive acquisitions by the Government.

(B) Proposals to identify technical data for sale or license to the Federal Government which the offeror, at its discretion, will identify and separately price so as to permit the Government of competitively acquire future requirements for such components.

(3) The evaluation factors specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be considered as negotiation objectives when an agency is making a noncompetitive award of a development contract or a production contract for a major system.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) may be waived in whole or in part if the contracting officer determines in writing that such provisions should not be applicable to such production contract, giving due consideration to the stability of the system's design, or otherwise would not be in the best interests of the United States in attaining the purposes for which the system is being procured, stating the reasons therefor, and including such determination and finding as part of the contract file.

§ 2319. Encouraging new competitors to broaden the industrial base

(a) Before establishing any prequalification requirement applicable to an offeror or its product which would be considered as an element of responsiveness to a solicitation, the head of the agency concerned shall—

(1) prepare a written justification stating the necessity for establishing the prequalification requirement and the reasons why free and open competition is not feasible;

(2) specify in writing and make available upon request all standards which a prospective contractor, or its product, must satisfy in order to become qualified, such standards to be limited to those least restrictive in order to attain the objective stated as the justification for the restriction and to meet the purposes necessitating the establishment of the prequalification requirement;

(3) specify an estimate of the costs of testing and evaluation likely to be incurred by a prospective contractor for that contractor to become qualified;

(4) ensure that (A) a prospective contractor is provided, upon request, a prompt opportunity to demonstrate its ability to meet the standards specified for qualification, utilizing qualified personnel and facilities of the agency concerned or another agency obtained through interagency agreement, or other methods approved by the head of the agency concerned, and (B) any testing and evaluation services provided under contract to the agency concerned should be provided by a contractor who will not be expected to benefit from an absence of additional qualified sources and who shall be required to adhere to any restriction

on technical data asserted by the prospective contractor seeking qualification; and

(5) ensure that a prospective contractor seeking qualification is promptly informed as to whether qualification has been attained, or in the event qualification has not been attained, information sufficient to specifically inform the prospective contractor why qualification was not attained.

(b) Before the head of an agency may enforce any existing prequalification requirement with respect to an offeror or its product, the head of an agency shall comply with the requirements of subsection (a). The head of an agency of a military department need not delay a procurement action in order to provide a prospective contractor with an opportunity to demonstrate its ability to meet the standards specified for qualification.

(c) In the event that the number of qualified sources or qualified products available to actively compete for anticipated future requirements is fewer than two actual manufacturers, the head of an agency concerned shall—

(1) periodically publish notice in the Commerce Business Daily soliciting additional sources or products to seek qualification; and

(2) bear the cost of conducting the specified testing and evaluation, but excluding the costs associated with producing the item or establishing the production, quality control, or other system to be tested and evaluated, only for a small business concern or a product manufactured by a small business concern which has met the standards specified for qualification, and which could reasonably be expected to compete, except that the head of an agency concerned shall bear such costs only if it determines that such additional qualified sources or products are likely to result in cost savings from increased competition for future requirements sufficient to amortize the costs incurred by the agency concerned.

The head of an agency may require a prospective contractor requesting testing and evaluation costs to certify as to its status as a small business concern, and, in good faith, rely thereon.

(d) Within seven years after the establishment of any prequalification requirement under subsection (a), or within seven years following an agency's enforcement of any existing prequalifications requirement under subsection (b), any such prequalification requirement shall be examined and revalidated in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section.

(e) Except in an emergency, whenever the head of an agency determines not to enforce an existing prequalification requirement for a solicitation, the agency concerned may not enforce any such prequalification requirement unless the military department complies with the requirements of subsection (a).

§ 2320. Technical data management to foster future competition

(a)(1) The head of an agency shall, by regulation, require that, whenever practicable, an offeror submitting a proposal for a contract shall furnish information in the proposal identifying—

(A) with respect to all items that will be delivered to the United States under the contract (other than items to which

paragraph (2) applies) those items for which technical data will not be provided to the United States; and

(B) with respect to technical data that will be delivered to the United States under the contract, any of such technical data that will not be provided with restrictions on the Government's right to use such data for governmental purposes.

(2) With respect to items that will be delivered to the United States under a contract described in paragraph (1) with respect to which it would be impracticable to ascertain, at the time the contract is entered into, the technical data relating to such items that will not be provided to the United States with unlimited rights, the contract shall require that the contractor provide identifying information similar to that required to be furnished under paragraph (1) at a time to be specified in the contract.

(3) The head of an agency shall ensure that the material furnished under paragraph (1) is considered in selecting the contractor for the contract.

(b) To foster competition for the acquisition of supplies and services to maintain a major system during its service life, the head of an agency with responsibility for the system shall ensure that the initial and all subsequent production contracts for a major system, developed under Government contract, contain appropriate provisions related to technical data, including—

(1) specifying the technical data to be delivered under the contract, if any, including delivery schedules therefor;

(2) establishing criteria for determining the acceptability of technical data to be delivered under the contract;

(3) establishing separate payment lines for the technical data to be delivered under the contract, if any, and authorizing the withholding of payments for failure to make timely deliveries of acceptable data;

(4) defining the respective rights of the Government and a contractor or subcontractor regarding any technical data to be delivered under the contract, including therein a definition of the term "developed at private expense";

(5) identifying, in advance of its delivery, technical data which is to be delivered with restrictions on the Government's right to use such data for governmental purposes;

(6) requiring the contractor and each subcontractor to be prepared to furnish, within 60 days, a written justification for any restriction to be asserted limiting the Government's right to use such data for governmental purposes, for as long as such restriction is asserted by the contractor or subcontractor;

(7) prohibiting a contractor from requiring a subcontractor or the Government to pay a fee, royalty, or other charge for the subcontractor's use of any technical data in the performance of a contract to furnish a component directly to the Government, except that data protected by patent, licensing agreement or any preexisting agreement involving a subcontractor's performance under a commercial contract, if the same data was made available by the contractor to the subcontractor furnishing that component;

(8) prohibiting the contractor from limiting, either directly or indirectly, a subcontractor from selling to the Government any

component which the subcontractor had previously furnished to the contractor wtithout restriction, except that the contractor may restrict a subcontractor from providing to the Government any component restricted by a preexisting agreement involving the subcontractor's performance for the contractor under its commercial contracts; and

(9) ascertaining and documenting the identity of the manufacturer of a component through the annotation of engineering drawings, the maintenance of lists, or otherwise.

The provisions specified in this subsection may be waived if the contracting officer determines in writing that any such provision could not be applicable to the production contract, or otherwise would not be in the best interests of the Government in attaining the purposes for which the system is being procured, stating the reasons therefor. Such determination shall be made part of the contract file.

(c) Nothing in this section or section 2318 prohibits an agency from including—

(1) in any competitive solicitation for the award of a contract, or

(2) as a negotiation objective when the agency is making a noncompetitive award,

a provision specifying in the contract the date after which the United States shall have the right to use or have used for any governmental purpose all technical data required to be delivered to the United States under contract.

§ 2320. Validating proprietary data restrictions

(a) To encourage the competitive acquisition of components needed to maintain a major system during its service life, a review of the validity of any restriction on the Government's right to use for governmental purposes technical data furnished under contract shall be initiated by the contracting officer, if the contracting officer, an agency advocate for competition, or the representative of the Small Business Administration assigned to the procurement center determines such a review is warranted and the contracting officer determines that compliance with the asserted restriction makes it impracticable to competitively procure the required component.

(b) Upon the written demand of the contracting officer, the contractor or subcontractor, as appropriate, shall submit its justification for the asserted restriction on the Government's right to use such data for governmental purposes certifying to the current validity of the asserted restriction within—

(1) 60 days, if the contract contains a provision that requires a contractor or subcontractor to be prepared to furnish a written justification for any restriction limiting the Government's right to use for governmental purposes technical data to be delivered under the contract, or

(2) 180 days, if the contract does not contain such a provision, except that the contracting officer may extend such time limits for a reasonable period for good cause shown.

(c) Upon a failure to submit any justification pursuant to the requirements of subsection (b), the contracting officer shall, after giving notice to the party asserting the restriction, promptly cancel

the restriction on the Government's right to use for governmental purposes technical data for which justification had been requested.

(d) If after review of the justification submitted pursuant to subsection (b), the contracting officer determines that the justification for the restriction on the Government's right to use the data for governmental purposes does not adequately support the asserted restriction on the technical data, the justification therefor shall be promptly subjected to technical review and audit.

(e) If after reviewing the findings of the technical review and audit, it is determined that the restriction on the Government's right to use such data for governmental purposes warrants challenge, the contracting officer shall issue a final decision pertaining thereto which shall be subject to the provisions of the Contract Disputes Act (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(f) If the Government's challenge to the restriction on the Government's right to use for governmental purposes technical data as certified pursuant to subsection (b) is sustained, upon final disposition—

(1) the restriction on the Government's right to use that technical data for governmental purposes shall be cancelled; and

(2) the contractor or subcontractor, as appropriate, shall be liable to the Government for the Government's cost of technically evaluating and auditing the asserted restriction, and the fees and other expenses, as defined in section 2412(d)(2)(A) of title 28, United States Code, incurred by the Government in challenging the asserted restriction if the asserted restriction, as certified, is found not to be substantially justified, unless special circumstances would make such awards unjust.

* * * * * * *

§ 2306a. Advocate for competition

(a) Each head of an agency shall—

(1) designate for such agency one officer or employee of the agency to serve as the advocate for competition for the agency;

(2) relieve such officer or employee of all duties and responsibilities that are inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities of the advocate for competition; and

(3) provide such officer or employee with such staff or assistance as may be necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the advocate for competition.

(b)(1) The advocate for competition of an agency shall promote competition in the procurement of property and services by the agency.

(2) The advocate for competition of an agency shall—

(A) review the purchasing and contracting activities of the agency;

(B) identify and report to the head of the agency—

(i) opportunities to achieve competition on the basis of price and other significant factors in the purchases and contracts of the agency;

(ii) solicitations and proposed solicitations which include unnecessarily detailed specifications or unnecessarily re-

strictive statements of need which may reduce competition in the procurement activities of the agnecy; and

(iii) any other condition or action which has the effect of unnecessarily restricting competition in the procurement actions of the agnecy; and

(C) prepare and transmit to the head of the agency an annual report describing his activities under this section.

* * * * * * *

§ 2318. Encouragement of competition and cost savings

The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures to ensure that personnel appraisal systems of the Department of Defense give appropriate recognition to efforts to increase competition and achieve cost savings in areas relating to contracts covered by this chapter.

* * * * * * *

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule XXVI, Paragraph 12 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill, including the provisions in Title I, Part J, have not been shown in this section of the report since, in the opinion of the Committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in existing law separately in the report in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. COHEN

MX MISSILE

As part of a coherent, long-term approach to arms modernization and reduction, I am supporting the procurement of a limited number of additional MX missiles this year, about half the number requested by the administration. Since the MX is but one component of an integrated modernization-arms control package, future MX procurement and deployment decisions should depend on future developments in the other areas, especially arms control and the small, single-warhead ICBM. Under the committee's amendment, the President must provide a writter assessment of the impact on U.S. strategic and arms control policies of future MX procurement requests. I believe that it would be very useful for this report to take into account the planned deployments of the Trident II (D-5) SLBM and the small ICBM.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI)

I have reservations about aspects of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and its implications for U.S. security and international stability. Testimony by administration witnesses indicates uncertainty and, perhaps, disagreement over the objectives and implications of the program. I continue to support research permitted under the ABM Treaty as a hedge against the possibility of future Soviet renunciation of that Treaty. However, I believe that commitment to the SDI should be reserved at least until the Congress is provided with a coherent plan for the program.

ANTISATELLITE WEAPONS

I disagree with the committee's action to, in effect, revoke the Tsongas amendment—i.e., Sec. 1235 of the Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-94)—which prohibits testing of any explosive or inert antisatellite (ASAT) warhead against objects in space unless the President certifies to the Congress that (1) the United States is endeavoring, in good faith, to negotiate with the Soviet Union a mutual and verifiable ban on antisatellite weapons; and (2) pending agreement on such a ban, testing is necessary to avert clear and irrevocable harm to the national security.

Testimony before the committee indicates that there are restrictions on ASATs that would be both verifiable and in our national security interest, and I believe that the United States should be actively seeking to negotiate verifiable restrictions on ASATs.

I fully support efforts to improve satellite and ground-network survivability.

MANEUVERING REENTRY VEHICLES

The development of maneuvering reentry vehicles (MARVs) has serious strategic implications. The administration has agreed to substantial reductions in this area. The committee has restored much of this funding. While there may be a case for evader MARVs, the case for killer MARVs is questionable. Further development of the evader MARV technology may be premature and may be difficult to distinguish from development of the killer MARV systems, which might better be restrained. I believe that great caution should be exercised in proceeding in this area.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

The administration's announced policy is to vigorously pursue a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. Last year, Senator Biden and I introduced a resolution in the Senate urging the President to continue such efforts on the multilateral level and to propose the resumption of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve a comprehensive and verifiable ban on chemical weapons. Thus far, a total of 40 senators have co-sponsored this resolution.

I have raised the matter of chemical weapons arms control with Soviet officials and scientists in meetings in Geneva, Moscow, and Washington. The response invariably has been encouraging. Hence, I was disappointed in the reportedly negative Soviet reaction to the recent U.S. proposed draft treaty on chemical weapons in the 40-nation Conference on Disarmament.

The issues in chemical weapons arms control are complex but, I believe, solvable. I believe that both sides must make good faith efforts to create a climate for successful negotiations in this and other areas. I have made several proposals in this regard and hope that they are acted upon.

I believe the President has taken a useful step in proposing a draft chemical weapons treaty. I also feel that acts such as the Soviet expression of willingness to consider limited on-site inspection measures in chemical weapons arms control can be helpful steps in spurring progress. I believe that resumption of bilateral chemical weapons negotiations could help significantly in moving the process forward.

In my view, it would be more productive for the United States, in submitting its proposal to ban chemical weapons, to defer consideration of funding for additional chemical weapons until such time as we can assess whether the negotiation of a chemical weapons treaty is feasible. Accordingly, I pressed for and supported the committee's decision to eliminate such funding from the Defense Authorization Act.

MILITARY PAY

In reducing the proposed pay raise for military personnel and capping pay for E-1's with under 4 months of service, the Armed Services Committee has made a serious mistake.

These actions seriously undercut efforts to recruit and retain adequate numbers of top quality people for our Armed Forces, and they endanger the viability of the All-Volunteer Force.

I am deeply troubled that the committee has not learned the lessons which the experience of the late seventies has made so painfully clear we cannot expect to meet our manpower requirements if we reduce incentives to serve.

The rationale for reducing the pay increase from the 5.5 percent requested by the administration to a level of 4 percent is that the services are meeting their manpower goals. We have to find outlay reductions to meet our defense budget target, the argument goes, and military pay is an area where we can achieve those savings quickly and with minimal risk.

Unfortunately, as was demonstrated only a few short years ago, the risk is not minimal. Those of us who have followed this issue remember all too well the similar argument which was made in the mid and late seventies. Because the volunteer force was doing well, and because there were pressures to reduce the defense budget, the manpower account became a convenient target for budget cutters. Pay was capped for several years, the GI bill (perhaps the most successful of all recruiting tools) was terminated, and recruit advertising funds were slashed.

The result was disastrous for the All-Volunteer Force. From its early success, it plummeted to such depths that Army Chief of Staff Edward (Shy) Meyer was referring to a "hollow Army" and Chief of Naval Operations Thomas Hayward was telling Congress of a "hemorrhage" in the Navy's ranks.

The services were falling short of their recruiting goals, and the quality of those recruits dropped precipitously. Worse, the exodus of quality Non Commissioned Officers caused serious readiness shortfalls, hampering the ability of our services to fulfill their missions.

Congress responded a few years ago with increases in basic pay aimed at restoring the comparability to civilian compensation which service personnel had been promised a decade before. We also approved increases in other special pays and incentives. The result has been the healthy manpower situation which we have today.

It would be especially unfortunate if, once again, the AVF's success would be permitted to encourage efforts to undermine it. Apparently forgotten are the problems of less than 5 years ago, when calls for a return to conscription were being made in the same corridors where decisions had been made which directly contributed to the AVF's decline.

Those of us who said we could restore the AVF's health by again providing fair pay and removing the disincentives for service were, fortunately, proven right. The AVF has prospered, and the quality of today's force is, by most reports, the best in our Nation's history.

But there are warning signs on the horizon, ones which the committee acknowledges at the same time that it chooses to ignore them. The committee's report language makes a persuasive case for the 5.5 percent increase requested by the President:

> However, it is not clear how long the military services will be able to sustain the current recruiting momentum. As the economy improves and the unemployment rate drops, the services will face increasing competition for 18–21 year olds. The services also must deal with the demographic reality that the size of the 18–21 year old youth population will decrease by approximately 15 percent between fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1992. Earlier this year, General John Wickham, the Army Chief of Staff, testified that the Army had experienced a 22-percent decline in the first quarter of fiscal year 1984 compared to last year in the number of young people coming into Army recruiting stations to take the military entrance exams. General Wickham suggested that this 22 percent reduction 'may be a harbinger of an upturn in the employment opportunities' for young people.

In the face of this well stated argument for adequate pay, it is difficult to understand a decision to cap pay and again freeze it for the top quality recruits the committee continues to call for through the quality standards it mandated in fiscal year 1981 and extended again this year. The committee must be willing to accept responsibility if the services have a hard time meeting these recruiting standards and if potential career personnel choose to leave the service, as they did a few years ago, because they can simply no longer afford to make the sacrifices required of them and their families.

All the weapons in the world will do us little good if we do not have the qualified personnel to operate them. Today's weaponry, reflecting the latest technological advances, requires the best young men and women we can attract. Recruiting and retaining those individuals will be an increasing challenge if we reduce the tools available to recruiters and military career counsellors.

A reduction in the military pay raise is especially debilitating in that it is not an isolated action. A number of "quality of life" military construction projects remain unfunded, some special pay changes requested by the administration were not approved by the committee, and efforts to reinstitute GI bill educational benefits continue to be thwarted.

In addition, service personnel and their families continue to pay out of their own pockets a substantial portion of the cost of moving when they receive their Permament Change of Station (PCS) orders. The Armed Services Committee has recommended appropriation of funds for an increase in the PCS allowance, and I am hopeful that this change will be made.

It is important to emphasize, I believe, that even with a 5.5 percent pay raise, service personnel would remain 5.1 percent behind their civilian counterparts in compensation. A reduction to a 4-percent raise would drop them even further behind.

The Department of Defense has said that the 3.5 percent increase approved by the House Armed Services Committee would result in approximately 30,000 fewer careerists by the end of fiscal year 1989 than would a 5.5 percent increase, if the reduction were not made up in subsequent years. The 4 percent raise would have results almost as damaging.

If the AVF is to achieve continuing success, it cannot afford the kind of roller-coaster ride which Congress seems intent on providing for it. What is needed is a consistent policy, one which provides fair compensation, comparable to that of the civilian sector. Our men and women in uniform make great sacrifices on their Nation's behalf. They deserve to be treated equitably.

Promises of "catch up" raises are not enough. This is especially so when service personnel learn year after year that the pay increases they have been told they can expect are reduced significantly by the time they actually receive them.

And we cannot ignore the detrimental impact of freezing E-1 pay again. If this is implemented, it will mean that E-1 pay will not have been increased since October 1, 1982—and that it will not be increased until at least October 1, 1985.

This is all too reminiscent of what took place during the period of the draft, when the pay of those in the lowest ranks was at unacceptably low levels. From 1946 to 1964, E-1 pay rose from only $75 to $78 a month, a $3 increase in 18 years. It was this situation which caused the late Rep. L. Mendel Rivers to push for cost-of-living increases in military pay.

If we have a gap of 3 years—or longer—in recruit pay increases, the job of recruiters will be much more difficult. A smaller demographic pool, an improved economy, lower unemployment, and rising youth wages, coupled with the pay freeze, could make the achievement of recruiting goals an insurmountable challenge.

Congress has a responsibility to our men and women in uniform. We cannot allow to happen again what happened only a few short years ago.

Recruit pay should not be frozen, and pay for all personnel should not be capped. Those who support these efforts must be prepared to accept the consequences of their actions if the AVF does encounter problems in future years. Simply saying that we can address the growing disparity between civilian and military pay at some later point is not enough. Fair compensation for the sacrifice of military life should be a humanitarian, not a budgetary, issue. A failure to provide that fair pay now is simply not right and will, I fear, have repercussions which will come back to haunt us in the not too distant future.

William S. Cohen.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. HART

I joined my Democratic colleagues in voting for this bill not because I think it is a good bill—on the whole it is not—but to provide the Senate something to amend. I voted for a number of amendments in committee which, unfortunately, failed. Without substantial amendment, this bill will weaken, not strengthen, our defenses. It will also move us closer to nuclear war.

The single greatest flaw in the bill is that it continues the MX missile program. The decision to fund production of an additional 21 MX missiles, despite clear evidence that this system will be no more survivable in fixed silos than it was in 1983 when the committee denied MX funds for fixed-silo basing, suggests political bargains are continuing at the expense of the need to avoid first-strike, "use it or lose it" weapons. No new arguments were presented to justify this action. I intend to join with several of my Colleagues to reverse this decision on the floor.

The reluctance of the committee to take any signficant actions with respect to the Strategic Defense Initiative also means allocating resources towards a program which most agree has, at best, vague objectives. No administration spokesman to date has been able to explain satisfactorily whether we are investing in defensive technologies simply as a hedge against possible Soviet break-out of ABM, as a means to add to our overall abilities at hard-point defense, or, as the President has suggested, as an effort to achieve the "perfect" defense which would render our population immune to nuclear threats. In light of the serious implications for strategic stability, for arms control, and for the overall direction of our strategic posture, I believe that we should fund only a modest SDI program until these questions have been addressed.

In addition, I deplore the committee's retreat from the ban on anti-satellite weapons tests which was contained in the Tsongas amendment. The administration's rationales for avoiding ASAT arms control—that the Soviets have a lead in this area, and that agreements would be inherently difficult to verify—are outweighed by the urgent need to avert a costly and dangerous new field of strategic competition. The military rationale for moving ahead with ASAT testing is also weak. When so many of our vital defense and intelligence activities depend on reconnaissance and communications satellites, taking steps which invariably will lead to threats to those satellites makes no sense.

I also take exception to the committee's decision to provide additional funding for the construction of ammunition depots and other facilities in Honduras. The argument that these facilities will be of a "temporary" nature simply does not stand up. It appears, on the contrary, that the administration has decided to establish and develop a permanent base in Honduras for use as a staging area for

U.S. military involvement in the region. I do not support that and I do not believe a majority of the American people support it either.

The bill continues the Navy on what I believe will prove a disastrous course. It begins two new programs, both of which will ensure we have two few ships and those largely of the wrong type. The first program is the DDG–51 guided missle destroyer. This ship is so weak in anti-submarine capability that it will, according to the Navy's own testimony, have to be protected from submarines by other destroyers. Its sole significant function is to carry the Aegis anti-air/anti-missile system. Aegis was a resounding failure in its first two operational tests. It reportedly did well in a third, very recent test, but the committee has not had time to analyze that test and see if it was realistic. Even if Aegis works, the Navy's plan to spend somewhere between $50 billion and $100 billion for Aegis ships will leave very little money for anything else. And a Navy composed of 15 big carriers, lots of Aegis ships and very little else will be a brittle, vulnerable and probably ineffective Navy.

The importance of the attack submarine in modern naval warfare is such that we can probably survive as a nation if we botch our aircraft carrier policy and our surface warship policy, so long as we are superior in attack submarines. Unfortunately, today we are not. The Soviet navy has about three times the number of attack submarines that we do. While ours are superior in some respects, particularly silencing and passive acoustic detection systems, theirs are generally faster, deeper diving, and, in the case of their deisel-electric boats, quieter when operating on battery.

This bill approves the initial R&D funds for a new class of nuclear powered attack submarines. The design characteristics of this class make it probable that our numerical inferiority will grow, not diminish, in the future. Already 10,000 tons and climbing in size, the lead unit is projected to cost about $1.6 billion in today's dollars. Its size is also likely to make it clumsy and easier to detect with all but passive acoustic methods. It essentially continues our long-standing practice of taking the previous submarine design and blowing it up in size.

The committee rejected my attempt to at least look at other nuclear submarine design options by having one of our National Laboratories undertake an independent (of the Navy) study of alternative submarine technologies and design concepts. This virtually ensures that any Navy submarine design, however deficient, will be approved simply from the lack of any alternative.

Unless we intend to risk losing our maritime power, we must make some basic changes in our attack submarine program. First and foremost, we must reject any program that leaves us outnumbered by 3 to 1. Second, we must explore a wide range of options in our development of a new nuclear attack submarine. We cannot continue building essentially the same old sub forever. Third, we must move to a mixed force of nuclear and non-nuclear powered attack submarines, not only because this is the only way we can afford the number of submarines we need, but also because a small diesel-electric boat is better than a large nuclear submarine for certain tasks.

The remainder of the bill generally continues what the military reformers call "business as usual." The Air Force is allowed to continue its preferred course made up of deep interdiction systems and complex F-15 fighters instead of less expensive, better F-16s. The Army, which is showing some real and very praiseworthy progress in the realms of doctrine, tactics, and unit cohesion, unfortunately continues to request and receive such defective weapons as the Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle and the DIVAD Air Defense Gun. The Marine Corps, after several years of innovation and openness to new ideas, seems of late to have gone dead in the water. And the Senate Armed Services Committee, despite a few positive actions such as keeping in the funds for a fourth attack submarine and adding some money for lighter-than-air aircraft research, approves largely what the Pentagon wants, in kind if not always in dollar amount.

The Nation deserves better from us, and I hope it will be given better on the Senate floor.

GARY HART.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. LEVIN

I voted to report our committee's version of the Fiscal 1985 (fiscal year 1985) Defense Authorization Act to the full Senate because I believe it is an improvement over the administration's initial and revised defense spending requests for next fiscal year.

Nevertheless, I must express serious reservations about some aspects of this bill, and I would hope that further action of the Senate floor will eliminate these deficiencies.

At a time when federal deficits pose an economic threat to our national security, I do not think that the real growth level in defense spending this bill embodies, compared to fiscal year 1984's spending, is fiscally and militarily justifiable.

This bill represents about 6.9 percent growth in the defense budget (after excluding inflation) over fiscal year 1984, based on the economic assumptions of the non-partisan and expert Congressional Budget Office. If the administration's economic assumptions are used to determine real growth, the committee's bill embodies an even larger increase compared with fiscal year 1984—8.3 percent.

Neither level of real growth can be justified as a necessary distribution of our nation's overall fiscal resources.

The full Senate and the Conference with the House will have the responsibility to constrain the real growth in this defense budget bill to a more reasonable level.

Furthermore, too much of the real growth in this defense budget funds redundant or destabilizing strategic nuclear systems and an excessive research budget for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) anti-ballistic missile program. Even with the $150 million reduction imposed by the committee, real growth in the SDI budget will be about 60 percent in fiscal year 1985.

While the 21 MX missiles approved by the committee are better than the 40 originally requested by the administration, the United States would be far safer militarily without any of these costly and destabilizing weapons.

The B-1B bomber remains an unnecessary investment of our scarce defense dollars, especially since this bill also contains full funding for the fiscal year 1985 request for the more capable Advanced Technology, or Stealth, bomber, which is to be deployed in even larger numbers than the B-1B.

Due to the billions of dollars allocated toward these strategic nuclear programs by the committee, this bill underfunds many more mundane, but ultimately far more important, combat readiness accounts for our conventional forces.

One of the best defenses against nuclear war is to raise the nuclear threshold by funding adequately our conventional forces. Despite the real growth it embodies, this bill does not do that, and therefore it does not strike the proper balance between maintaining a sufficient nuclear deterrent and supporting an adequate conventional military capability.

The $600 million dollars for the remaining 21 MX missiles in this bill would be better invested in the 19 conventional forces programs I proposed be the recipients of these dollars during the committee's deliberations. None of these programs are as glamorous as the MX, but all are more necessary to maintaining the safety of our citizens. In addition, there are many other conventional forces programs which are not funded adequately in this bill.

Finally, as I have said before, the future for these readiness programs probably is even more bleak than is the present, and this bill does little to reverse this situation. By continuing to fund several "big-ticket" weapons systems which will absorb large amounts of defense dollars in the future, we are leaving ourselves only unpleasant options when it comes time to pay the bills. Fewer total federal budget dollars will be available, but the bills will have to be paid. Today's obligations will mean that the readiness accounts become the "bill-payers" of tomorrow. The end result will not be positive for American security.

CARL LEVIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. KENNEDY

The Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985 as reported by the committee represents, on balance, a positive contribution to our national security. I am particularly pleased to see the committee begin to take on the pressing issue of reforming the military procurement system to insure that our defense dollars will be wisely and efficiently spent.

Nevertheless, I have a number of serious concerns about the bill. I believe that the authorization level of $299 billion for the national defense function is neither justified militarily nor appropriate in view of looming $200 billion a year deficits that face our nation far into the indefinite future and threaten our economic well-being.

I continue to oppose any funding for the MX program. Although the committee did reduce the number of MX missiles to 21, it rejected efforts to cancel the program. The MX missile is a gold-plated weapon without a purpose. It cannot be protected. It is a destabilizing force in an already precarious situation and the massive expenditure comes at the expense of readiness and capability of our conventional forces. I believe in maintaining a triad of strategic nuclear forces that includes survivable land-based leg—not one that is crippled before it is built.

Paradoxically, the deployment of MX will make us weaker, not stronger. Whereas the Soviets have little or no incentive to attack our Minuteman missiles in their silos, the MX, by posing a first-strike threat to their land-based systems, will increase the incentive for the Soviets to attack us in a crisis. Recent data from the Air Force reveal that just as we begin to deploy the MX in the late 1980's Soviet improvements in missile accuracy may destroy all but 1 percent of our fixed-silo land-based missile force. One percent of 100 is one surviving MX missile.

I also regret that the committee has chosen once again to forge ahead with the production of B–1 bombers which, given the current need for an effective penetrating bomber, is a wasteful use of the defense dollar. The committee did act favorably upon an amendment that I introduced prohibiting any funds from being used to build more than 100 B–1 bombers. I believe that it is essential for the Air Force to turn its attention to development of the ATB rather than entertain notions of building additional B–1 bombers.

I am deeply disturbed by the committee's apparent willingness to accept the dangerous premise behind the President's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, a program that will not only consume billions of dollars but will also jeopardize our efforts to obtain meaningful arms control.

In March of last year, President Reagan called his proposal for a space-based weapon system "a vision of the future which offers hope." This is not a "vision;" it is a mirage. And far from offering hope, the President's proposal is a certain prescription for an arms race in outer space.

A decade ago we abandoned the fruitless pursuit of security through ballistic missile defense and ratified the ABM Treaty. None of the technologies now under discussion or even imaginable can overcome the insurmountable obstacles to an effective ballistic missile defense, as the recent report of the Office of Technology Assessment demonstrates. As OTA observed, an effective ballistic missile defense is "so remote that it should not serve as the basis of public expectation or national policy."

The President's Star Wars strategy is also irresponsible because it undermines the basic principle of nuclear deterrence upon which the nuclear balance has rested for over 30 years. By creating the illusion that one nation might be invulnerable to attack it might give that nation the false confidence that it could launch a first-strike without fear of retaliation.

Furthermore, the layered defense against ballistic missiles envisioned by President Reagan in his Strategic Defense Initiative is plainly inconsistent with the ABM Treaty. In Article V of the Treaty each nation undertakes not to "develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based." If we pursue the administration's plans to develop, test and deploy space-based defenses and their components we will soon be required either to withdraw from the Treaty or to violate it. I am gratified however, that the committee has at least postponed the day of reckoning by accepting report language stressing our intention to observe the continued obligations assumed by the United States and the Soviet Union under the ABM Treaty.

If we are to avoid the ultimate catastrophe of nuclear destruction followed by nuclear winter, the answer lies not in the pursuit of more exotic strategic weaponry. Rather, our hope for enduring peace lies in a strong conventional defense that raises the nuclear threshold, and a stable arms control regime that assures that neither side will have anything to gain from the use of nuclear weapons.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. BINGAMAN

Last year in my first year on the Armed Services Committee, I noted in my "Additional Views" the imbalance I perceived between the strategic and conventional force modernization efforts. That imbalance continued this year.

We are providing funds in the fiscal year 1985 authorization bill for every strategic weapons system requested by the Pentagon, no matter how marginal an increment to our deterrent the system contributes and no matter how duplicative the programs are of one another. In the case of the MX missile where the committee has reduced the number of missiles to be produced in half, we have reduced the $3.2 billion procurement budget by only 18 percent and the $2.4 billion research budget not at all.

At the same time, despite a 7.5-percent real increase in the defense budget, we cannot sustain M-1 tank production at the 840/year level, and we cannot procure enough tactical fighters to keep our tactical air force from growing older each year.

It is often said that the strategic and theater nuclear forces make up a relatively small proportion of the Defense budget. But in the research and development and procurement accounts of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy over $45 billion is allocated in this bill for these forces, or 15 percent of the budget. If one adds in the military construction, manpower, and operations and maintenance costs, the percentage surely reaches 25 percent of the national security budget account. These are significant resources and they should not be treated as all but inviolate to cuts. As the Congress makes further reductions in the Defense budget in the course of this year, I hope that a greater proportion of these cuts will come at the expense of the nuclear programs than has been the case in this bill. The MX program is the clearest candidate for elimination by the Congress.

I would also like to draw my colleagues' attention to two other issues on which there was substantial disagreement within the Armed Services Committee: anti-satellite arms control and military construction in Honduras.

The committee has adopted language regarding testing of anti-satellite weapons which is intended to gut the Tsongas amendment which the Senate passed unanimously last year. I opposed that effort.

The administration is apparently unwilling to "endeavor, in good faith, to negotiate with the Soviet Union a mutual and verifiable ban on anti-satellite weapons," as the Tsongas amendment requires before we test our F-15 launched miniature homing vehicle ASAT against an object in space. Several members of the committee suggested that only a minor modification of the Tsongas amendment was needed, namely replacement of the word "ban" by the word "limitations." A total ban on all classes of weapons and devices which could possibly interfere with or damage a satellite is clearly not possible to achieve. But all of the non-Administration witnesses who appeared before the committee to discuss the ASAT issue felt that negotiations should be undertaken promptly to reach more limited agreements on ASAT weapons. Dr. Robert Buchheim, our former ASAT negotiator, was most eloquent on this point, stressing that the negotiations should begin "today and if not today, tomorrow." I believe that the central issue to be taken up on the Senate floor comes down to one question: do we want to continue to insist that the administration should endeavor to engage in ASAT arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union or are we willing to forsake any possibility of arms control in this area?

The second issue I want to highlight relates to American intervention in Central America. The bill contains funding for construction of two permanent facilities in Honduras, which bear no relation to our training efforts or our security assistance efforts in the region. They are the $2.9 million Army prestock point in San Lorenzo and the $1.5 million aircraft munitions storage facility in Palmerola.

These represent the first step toward committing American forces to combat in Central America. I did not oppose a third military construction project in Honduras, a $4.3 million facility to support an Army unit stationed at Palmerola with a non-combat mission. But I have not heard a persuasive justification for pre-positioning equipment and ammunition in Honduras. I fear that by a "back door" approach we may be sliding toward a commitment of U.S. ground forces in Honduras in the absence of adequate public debate over the wisdom and necessity of such a decision. I find these facilities particularly hard to justify in light of the President's assertion at his May 22 press conference that our friends and neighbors in Central America don't want American manpower there and we "have never had any consideration of doing that or any thought of doing that at all."

I offered an amendment in committee to strike the funding for these two facilities. The amendment failed on a 9 to 9 tie vote. I plan to pursue this question on the Senate floor.

I have highlighted my major differences with the bill as reported by the committee in these comments. But let me note in conclusion the great deal of consensus in the committee on most of the programs authorized by this bill. I was particularly gratified by the strong support the committee, and the Chairman in particular, gave to the technology base research programs which have not fared well in recent years, even as the defense research budget as a whole has mushroomed. This basic research is critical to our future defense capabilities and can be slighted only at great risk in the long run.

In the matter of the increased use of polygraphs by the Defense Department, I am happy that the committee has decided to restrict the expansion of such use to a pilot program, in order to be able to evaluate more closely the possible problems of the technique before very widespread use is instituted.

In addition, I would express the expectation that, in the case of investigations of unauthorized disclosure of information, the use of the polygraph should be restricted to matters involving serious compromise of national security, when such use appears to be necessary as a tool to pursue the investigation. Because of some doubts as to the fraction of false positives produced by the polygraph technique, its use should not be triggered automatically by minor matters.

Finally, I would like to commend the Chairman of the committee, who will be retiring at the end of this Congress, for the manner in which he has led the committee. This will be his final Defense Authorization bill, and as the next most junior member of the Minority I have been given the final word in the Chairman's final report.

In the year and a half that I have been in the Senate and that we have served together on the Armed Services Committee, I have been impressed with the Chairman's fairness and integrity and the breadth of knowledge which he has brought to bear on the many difficult issues which confront us.

While the Chairman and I have many disagreements on specific issues, I have always found him to be a formidable advocate for his positions. As a new member of the committee, I have been grateful for the courtesies he has extended to me and for the opportunity he has afforded me to fully participate in Committee activities.

I am sure that I am joined by all my colleagues in wishing the Chairman well in all of his future endeavors.

JEFF BINGAMAN.

○